

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM
THE LORD'S SUPPER
AND FEET WASHING

PROPERTY OF
AKRON CHURCH OF GOD LIBRARY

H. M. Riggle	
AUTHOR	Christian Baptism, The
TITLE	Lords Supper & Feet Washing
DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME

PROPERTY OF
AKRON CHURCH OF GOD LIBRARY

Christian Baptism The Lord's Supper and Feet-Washing

By H. M. RIGGLE

*Author of "The Kingdom of God," "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary,"
"Two Works of Grace," "The Sabbath and the Lord's Day,"
"Bible Readings," "Man: His Present and Future,"
and "Hell and Everlasting Punishment."*



Printed by

FAITH PUBLISHING HOUSE

920 W. Mansur Ave., Guthrie, Okla. 73044

PREFACE.

Because the truths of the gospel were being assailed on every side, and many heresies and false doctrines were being introduced, the apostle said, "I am set for the defense of the gospel."

At a very early date in the Christian Era the true teachings and ordinances of Christ became corrupted. Some of these were entirely discarded, while substitutes of human invention took the place of others. This has been true down to the present time. False theories and human traditions, imbibed in early youth, at mother's knee, are not so easily cast away. It takes argument, based upon the positive declarations of eternal truth, to convince men of their error. The contents of this book will be found pointed and argumentative. The writer endeavored to condense his thoughts, so that the reader would not need to peruse an entire volume in order to get a thought. Yet the work will be found quite comprehensive. It clearly sets forth the rites of primitive Christianity. It defends these sacred institutions against the attacks of false teachers and their doctrines. With a deep desire that it will be very enlightening to the readers, I am,

Yours for the truth,

H. M. RIGGLE.

April 1, 1908. Cambridge Springs, Pa.

CONTENTS.

I. BAPTISM.

What Is Baptism?.....	7
Scriptural Testimony and Examples of Immersion.....	23
The Voice of History.....	34
Objections to Immersion Considered.....	38
Sprinkling not Baptism.....	48
The Arguments of Those who Pour Refuted.....	51
Trine Immersion Is without Scriptural Authority.....	55
Infant Baptism.....	74
Proper Candidates for Baptism.....	96
The Design of Baptism.....	97
Born of Water and of the Spirit.....	111
Importance of Baptism.....	116
Baptism a New Testament Institution.....	122
John's Baptism.....	129
Christian Baptism.....	135

II. THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Lord's Supper.....	147
What Constitutes the Lord's Supper?.....	148
Lord's Supper and Communion Are the Same.....	151
Did Christ and His Disciples Eat the Passover?.....	152
When Was the Lord's Supper Instituted?.....	158
It Is an Ordinance of the New Testament.....	162
How Long shall its Observance Continue?.....	169
What It Teaches.....	169
Who Are Worthy?.....	174
"This Is My Body"; "This Is My Blood.".....	176

III. FEET-WASHING.

Feet-Washing	187
Feet-Washing Commanded.....	190

It Is an Ordinance.....	195
Christ Instituted It.....	201
Time and Place of its Institution.....	204
The Bethany-Supper Theory Considered.....	206
The Solemnity Surrounding its Institution.....	217
To be Observed in Public Assembly of Saints.....	218
The Religious Aspect of Feet-Washing.....	222
Delivered to the Churches by the Apostles.....	224
Historical Proof.....	226
Why Not More Frequently Mentioned? Answered.....	234
What It Teaches.....	236
The Substitution Theory Refuted.....	240
Old Custom Considered.....	243
Good Works.....	251

Reprint Publisher's Foreword

(Year 1977)

Nearly seventy years have elapsed since the publication of this volume, "Christian Baptism, The Lord's Supper, and Feet Washing," written by H. M. Riggle. As a result, this book of vital Bible truths on the three ordinances of the Lord's House has been out of print for many years. Over the past several years this publisher has received a number of requests that this volume be reprinted and made available to the reading public.

Since these Bible doctrines are so essential in coming to and maintaining a well-balanced, successful Christian life, it is the pleasure of the publisher to produce and present this verbatim reprint edition with the fervent prayer that the Holy Spirit will illuminate these Bible truths to the mind and heart of every reader.

This reprint edition was reproduced by the lithographic process at the Faith Publishing House, Guthrie, Okla. The size of the original type page was increased by five percent, which improves the legibility.

—L. D. Pruitt
Guthrie, Oklahoma, May 5, 1977

Christian Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Feet-Washing.

I. BAPTISM.

WHAT IS BAPTISM?

THIS is a question of great importance, one which should not be treated lightly. A discussion once took place over the meaning of a single word. Upon the decision rested the destiny of a world. The word in question was "die." And because a wrong interpretation was believed and accepted, Adam and Eve lost paradise, holiness, purity, and eternal life, and reaped sorrow, labor, and death. The result was momentous to millions of human souls. Eternity alone will reveal the awful consequences. O the importance of right belief! What we believe regulates our conscience; conscience regulates our conduct; conduct forms our character; and character fixes our destiny.

Truth is an eternal principle; it can never be destroyed. The truth, believed, will effect our eternal salvation; yes, secure for us an eternal inheritance above. At the cost of traditions, early teachings we may have imbibed, creeds of men, human dogmas, and all the contradictory faiths extant, it will pay to "buy the truth, and sell it not." What, then, is the truth respecting baptism?

Is it possible that the Savior, the wisest Lawgiver that has ever given precepts to man, has left us to speculate as to his positive commands? Has he so mystified his teachings that we are left in doubt and uncertainty? Must we simply guess at the truth? No! thank God! "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

When Jehovah delivered to Abraham, and later to Israel, a positive precept to observe, he expressed it by a specific word. That word expressed the act, a specific act. Circumcision—"cutting round." This is the one and only meaning of the word. You see, the all-wise Lawgiver selected a term that expressed the very act to be performed. Those to whom it was given could not make a mistake in this. They all knew what it meant. The same is true of baptism. When the Lord gave the last great commission to his ministry and enjoined upon them the administering of the great Christian ordinance, he employed a specific term, a word which in itself expresses the very act to be performed. We humbly bow our heads in reverence to his great wisdom in this, for it leaves us in no uncertainty. Baptism, like circumcision, requires a specific act to be performed, and the word which our Savior selected expresses that very act.

It follows, then, that if sprinkling had been intended, the Lord would have selected the word which expresses it. That word is *raino*—to sprinkle, and *rhantismos*—sprinkling. Turning to Mat. 28:19, we read the grand commission to all nations, and neither

raino nor *rhantismos* is found in it; nor in any English translation do we find the word sprinkling or sprinkle. Right here I will state the conclusive and overwhelming fact that not one text in the entire New Testament referring to this sacred ordinance contains the word *raino* or *rhantismos* in any Greek manuscript. Again, there is not a single English translation in which the word sprinkle or sprinkling can be found in any text in the New Testament referring to this ordinance. Then, sprinkling, not being found in the commission nor in any text that refers to baptism, can not express this sacred ordinance. Sprinkling is not baptism—no *rantizo* in it.

Again, if pouring had been intended, Jesus would have selected the word that expresses it. That word is *cheo*—to pour, and *ekcheo*—to pour out. There is no such word in the commission nor in any text bearing on the subject. This being true, the act of pouring is no more baptism than is sprinkling.

We will now consider the word wash. Does wash express this ordinance? If so, Christ employed the word that expresses a washing. This is important. Washing is a generic, or general, word, not a specific word. Washing may be done in various ways. If Jesus employed wash to express this sacred institution, then there might be different modes of administering it. What is the evidence? *Louo* is the word that signifies a general washing, and *nipto*, a partial one. We turn and read the commission in Mat. 28: 19 and Mark 16:16, and we find neither of these

words in the original manuscripts. Not a single translator, ancient or modern, so far as I have ever learned, has rendered the text wash, or "washing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Since the Savior did not select *rhantismos*—sprinkling, *ekcheo*—to pour, nor *louo*—washing, as the terms to express the action in this Christian ordinance, it follows conclusively that neither sprinkling nor pouring is baptism. They can not be.

What, then, is the specific word that Jesus employed to express the specific action in this institution? That word is *baptizo*. It might be well to remark here that *baptizo* is not a radical, but a derivative, word. Its root is *bapto*. *Bapto* has but one literal meaning—to dip. "May dip—*bapto*—the tip of his finger in water." Luke 16:24. "I shall give a sop, when I have dipped—*bapto*—it." John 13:26. "Clothed with a vesture dipped—*bapto*—in blood." Rev. 19:13. "He that dippeth—*embapto*—his hand with me." Mat. 26:23. "One of the twelve that dippeth—*embapto*—with me." Mark 14:20. "When he dipped—*embapto*—the sop." John 13:26. From these texts, where the word *bapto* occurs in the original, it will be seen that its meaning is to dip. All authorities of any note agree that *bapto* means, literally, to dip, and as a secondary meaning, to dye or color, which is the result of dipping. Since *baptizo* is derived from *bapto*, it receives its specific meaning and radical, immutable form from that word.

Bapto is the root, and *baptizo*, the stem and tree. Now, if the root of a tree is chestnut, will not the tree be chestnut too? What would you think of a hickory root, a mulberry stem, and cherry branches and leaves, yet all one tree? “Ridiculous!” you exclaim. No more so than the teaching of modern theology that the root is dip; the stem, pour; and the branches, sprinkle. You can settle down on this fact, that when the root is *bapto*—dip—and the tree *baptizo*, it retains the same nature throughout. So clearly teaches the Bible. Let it be remembered that *baptizo* is the specific word which Christ selected to express the specific action in this ordinance.

I will now appeal to the highest authority on this point—the Bible—to find its true meaning. In the Old Testament the Hebrew word *tabal* is rendered by the word baptize. When the Jews translated their Scriptures into Greek, whenever they came to this word *tabal*, they rendered it baptize, and when our translators came to this same word, they rendered it by the English word dip. So dip in English and baptize in Greek mean the same, and both these words are equivalent to *tabal* in Hebrew. I here give fourteen of these texts: “And the priest shall *dip* his finger in the blood.” Lev. 4: 6. “And shall *dip* them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water.” Lev. 14: 6. “And *dip* them in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water.” Lev. 14: 51. “And a clean person shall take hyssop, and *dip* it in water.” Num. 19: 18.

“*Dip* thy morsel in the vinegar.” Ruth 2:14. “*Dip* it in the blood.” Exod. 12:22. “And let him *dip* his foot in oil.” Deut. 33:24. “Yet shalt thou *plunge* me in the ditch.” Job 9:31. “And he *dipped* his finger in the blood.” Lev. 9:9. “And *dipped* in an honeycomb.” 1 Sam. 14:27. “And *dipped* it in water.” 2 Kings 8:15. “The feet of the priest that bare the ark were *dipped* in the brim of Jordan.” Josh. 3:15. “And they took Joseph’s coat, and killed a kid, and *dipped* the coat in the blood.” Gen. 37:31. “Then went he down and *dipped* himself seven times in Jordan.” 2 Kings 5:14. Baptize, according to all the above texts, means to dip, or immerse.

We will next consult the Greek lexicographers, the most learned and competent witnesses in the world as to the meaning of *baptizo*, the word Jesus employed to express the action in this ordinance.

SCAPULA, 1579—*Bapto*, the root: “To dip, to immerse; also, to dye, because that may be done by immersing.” *Baptizo*: “To dip, to immerse; also, to submerge or overwhelm, to wash, to cleanse.”

HENRICUS STEPHANUS, 1572—*Bapto* and *baptizo*: “To dip or immerse, as we dip things for the purpose of dying them, or we immerse them in water.”

ROBERTSON, 1676—*Baptizo*: “To immerse, to wash.”

SCHLEUSNER, 1824—*Baptizo*: “Properly, it signifies: I immerse, I dip, I immerse in water. 2d. It signifies: I wash or cleanse by water, because for the

most part, a thing must be dipped or plunged into water, that it may be washed."

PASOR, 1650—*Bapto*, *baptizo*: "To dip, to immerse, to dye, because it is done by immersing."

PARKHURST—*Baptizo* "primarily means to dip, immerse, or plunge in water."

DONNEGAN—*Baptizo*: "To immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge, to saturate." *Baptismos*: "Immersion, submersion, the act of washing or bathing." *Baptistes* (a baptist): "One who immerses, submerges."

DR. JOHN JONES—*Bapto*: "I dip, I stain." *Baptizo*: "I plunge, I plunge in water, dip, baptize, bury, overwhelm."

GREENFIELD—*Baptizo*: "Means to immerse, immerse, submerge, sink."

PROF. ROAST—*Bapto*: "To plunge, to immerse, to submerge."

BRETCHNEIDER—"An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism. This is the meaning of the word: for in *baptizo* is contained the idea of a complete immersion under water: at least so is *baptisma* in the New Testament."

BASS—*Baptizo*: "To dip, immerse, plunge in water, to bathe one's self." *Baptisma*: "Immersion, dipping, plunging."

STOKIUS—*Baptizo*, "generally and by force of the word, indicates the idea of simply dipping and diving; but properly, it means to dip or immerse in water."

Here we have the united testimony of some good authorities that *baptizo*, the word employed by Christ in the great commission, means, literally, TO DIP, TO IMMERSE. Not a single one of them renders *baptizo* to sprinkle or pour. You may search through all the archives of nineteen hundred years of history, and you will not find a single lexicographer or classic author that translates or defines *baptizo* by the word sprinkle or pour. Without a single exception they all translate the word dip, plunge, or immerse. With a tropical, or secondary, meaning it is sometimes rendered wash, for this was done by dipping. Wash and cleanse are but the figurative meaning—the result of dipping. Dip, immerse, is the primary meaning of the word, and wash is the effect. So all authorities agree. To the above list may be added—

LIDDELL and SCOTT, whose lexicon is the standard among the English-speaking people, both for classic and for Bible Greek—*Baptizo*: “to dip in or under water.”

BEZA, an eminent translator of the New Testament from Greek to Latin, is compelled to admit: “Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified. . . . To be baptized in water signifies no other than to be immersed in water, which is the external ceremony of baptism.”
—*Comments on Mark 7:4.*

MARTIN LUTHER—“Baptism is nothing else than the word of God with immersion in water.”—*Fifth of the Smallicald Articles drawn up by Luther.*

“Baptism is a Greek word, and may be translated immersion, as when we immerse something in water, that it may be wholly covered. And although it is almost wholly abolished (for they do not dip the whole child, but only pour a little water on it), it ought, nevertheless, to be wholly immersed, and then immediately drawn out; for that the etymology of the word seems to demand.”—*Op.*, Vol. I, p. 366.

CALVIN—“The word *baptizo* signifies to immerse, and it is certain that immersion was the practise of the ancient church.”—*Instit.*, Book IV, sec. 15.

WILLIAM TYNDALE—“The plunging into water signifies that we die and are buried into Christ, as concerning the old life of sin, which is Adam; and the pulling out again, signifies that we rise again with Christ, to a new life.”

I will here insert a collection of testimonies from the world's greatest scholars, compiled in “Ordinances of the New Testament.”

GILL—“This word in its first and primary sense signifies to dip, or plunge into; and so it is rendered by our best lexicographers, *mergo*, *immergo*, to dip, or to plunge into. And in a secondary, consequential sense, *abluo*, *lavo*, to wash, is used, because what is washed is dipped, there being no proper washing but by dipping.”—*As quoted by Winebrenner.*

PROF. C. ANTHON, of New York—“There is no authority whatever for the singular remark made by Rev. Dr. Spring, relative to the force of *baptizo*. The primary meaning of the word is to dip or immerse;

and its secondary meanings, if ever it had any, all refer, in some way or other, to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, etc., are entirely out of the question.”—*As quoted by Winebrenner.*

GEORGE CAMPBELL—“The word *baptizein*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin Fathers, *tingere*, the term used for dying cloth, which was immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning.”—*Note on Mat. 3: 11.*

PROF. STUART, of Andover Theological Seminary—“*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into any liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this.”—*As quoted by Winebrenner.*

VITRINGA—“The act of baptizing, is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word.”

HOSPINIANUS—“Christ commanded us to be baptized; by which word it is certain immersion is signified.”

GURTLERUS—“To baptize, among the Greeks, is undoubtedly to immerse, to dip, and baptism is immersion. . . . The thing commanded by our Lord, is baptism; immersion into water.”

BUDDEUS—“The words *baptizo* and *baptismos* are not to be interpreted of aspersions, but always of immersion.”

SALMASIUS—“Baptism is immersion, and was ad-

ministered in former times according to the force and meaning of the word."

AUGUSTI, Vol. v, p. 5—"The word baptism according to etymology and usage, signifies to immerse, submerge, etc.; and the choice of the expression betrays an age in which the latter custom of sprinkling had not been introduced."

BRENNER—"The word corresponds in signification with the German word *taufen*, to sink into the deep."

PAULLUS, in his Com., Vol. I, p. 278—"The word baptize signifies, in Greek, sometimes to immerse, sometimes to submerge."

RHEINHARD: "Ethics," Vol. v, p. 79—"In sprinkling, the symbolical meaning of the ordinance is wholly lost."

SCHOLZ, on Mat. 3: 6—"Baptism consists in the immersion of the whole body in water."

BRETSCHNEIDER—"In the word *baptizo* and *baptisma* is contained the idea of a complete immersion under water; at least so is *baptisma* in the New Testament."

DR. CHAMBERS, on the sixth chapter of Romans—"The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion."

The last thirteen testimonies are from Hinton's "History of Baptism." He represents them as pedobaptists. So they were men who belonged to sects opposed to immersion as a mode of baptism.

WILSON, Emphatic Diaglott—"Bapto occurs three times [in the New Testament], Luke 16: 24; John 13:

26; Rev. 19:13, and is always translated dip in the common version. *Baptizo* occurs seventy-nine times; of these, seventy-seven times it is not translated at all, but transferred; and twice, viz., Mark 7:4; Luke 11:38, it is translated wash, without regard to the manner in which it was done."

All lexicographers translate *bapto* by the word immerse, dip, or plunge; not one by sprinkle or pour. No translator has ever ventured to render it sprinkle or pour in any version.

I will next bring forward the testimony of eminent translators, commentators, and scholars, on the true meaning of Rom. 6:4—"Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so ye also should walk in newness of life."

DODDRIDGE, on Rom. 6:4—"It seems the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptism by immersion, as most usual in these early times."

McKNIGHT, Presbyterian—"In baptism . . . the baptized person is buried under water." Of Jesus' baptism the same translator and author says, He was "buried under the water, by John, and raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future death and resurrection."

BARNES, on Rom. 6:4—"It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion."

LOCKE—"We did own some kind of death by being buried under the water, which being buried with him, *i. e.*, in conforming to his burial, as a confession of our being dead, was to signify that as Christ was raised from the dead into a glorious life with his Father, even so we, being raised from our typical death and burial in baptism should lead a new sort of life."

DR. ADAM CLARK—"It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water."

SAMUEL CLARK—"In primitive times, the manner of baptizing was by immersion, or dipping the whole body under water in baptism."

WELLS—"St. Paul here alludes to immersion, or dipping the whole body under water in baptism; which, he intimates, did typify the death and burial (of the person baptized) to sin, and his rising up out of the water did typify his resurrection to newness of life."

GEORGE WHITEFIELD—"It is certain that in the words of our text, Rom. 6: 3, 4, there is an allusion to the manner of baptism, which was by immersion."

JOHN WESLEY—" 'Buried with him'—alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

WHITBY—"It being so expressly declared here, Rom. 6: 4, and Col. 2: 12, that we are buried with Christ in baptism, by being buried under water, and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his

death, by dying to sin, being taken hence; and this immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries, . . . and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the author of this institution. . . . It were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use."

THOMAS CHALMERS, one of the most distinguished, learned, and highly authoritative Presbyterian preachers, in his "Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans," says, "We doubt not that the prevalent style of the administration, in the apostles' days, was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water."

To this list of conclusive testimony, I will add the fact that the majority of translators have not translated *baptizo* and *baptismos*, but only transferred them. Baptize and baptism are not English words, but Greek, simply transferred and not translated. The reason is apparent. Had they translated these words into pure English, a Romish practise that has been adopted by a host of Protestant ministers and practised by their various sects, would have been fully exposed as a mere rite of human invention. But, thank God! a few translators had the honesty to translate the word into pure English. A few of their translations lie on my table—Bible Union, H. T. Anderson, Rotherham, Campbell, Doddridge and McKnight, Wilson, and others. They all translate the word immerse. I have over thirty versions before

me, both ancient and modern. Of these, nineteen render the word immerse and six dip; one renders it bathe and cleanse. Not a single one in over thirty versions renders the word sprinkle or pour.

To the united testimony of all the foregoing lexicographers, reformers, eminent scholars, translators, versions, ancient and modern, and the plain rendering of the Bible on the meaning of baptism, could be added scores of evidences from competent authorities, that bear out the same truth, namely, Immersion only is baptism; but I deem the foregoing sufficient.

The reader will grasp the importance of the question, What is baptism? This question, answered in a decisive manner, lays the foundation for all other points relating to the subject. Since *raino*—sprinkle—and *cheo*—pour—can not be found in a single text in the Bible that refers to this Christian institution, it follows conclusively that sprinkling and pouring are not baptism. They can not be.

Jesus, in giving the great commission to his ministers, which commission was to continue to the end of the world, told them to go into all the world, to preach the gospel to every creature, and thus to make disciples of all nations. In this same commission he commanded them to administer the great Christian ordinance that he himself had instituted. He selected a specific word that clearly expresses the action to be performed in that ordinance. Was that word *raino*—to sprinkle? No. Was it *cheo*—to pour? No. That word was *baptizo*—to dip or immerse. Nothing else,

then, is baptism. There is no appeal from this conclusion. A solid phalanx of the greatest lexicographers the world has ever produced all agree that the literal, primary meaning of *baptizo* is dip and immerse. Not one can be found who renders the word by sprinkle or by pour. Is this not decisive?

Again, to this list I have added the testimony of such reformers as Luther, Calvin, Wesley—men who, though they practised the popish rite of sprinkling as a more convenient mode, freely admitted that *baptizo* signifies to immerse and that immersion was the primitive mode. Then comes a host of commentators and eminent scholars, all of whom agree on this one point, that *baptizo* means dip and immerse and that this was the primitive mode or action. Next to these we have the translators who have translated the word *baptizo* into English, not one of whom renders it sprinkle or pour. Then in all the versions of the New Testament, ancient and modern, the word is rendered immerse, dip, wash, cleanse, and plunge. Not a single one renders it sprinkle or pour.

On this solid foundation we stand and declare in the name of the God of heaven that immersion only is baptism. This being a fact, it follows that every mention of baptism in the New Testament with reference to this ordinance, is immersion. It can not be anything else. Baptism is an action. That action is dip. It is impossible to find dip in sprinkle or sprinkle in dip. So *bapto* can not mean sprinkle nor *raino* dip. One text will forever settle that point—

“And the priest shall take some of the log of oil, and *pour* it into the palm of his own left hand. And the priest shall *dip* his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall *sprinkle* of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord.” Lev. 14:15, 16.

SCRIPTURAL TESTIMONY AND EXAMPLES OF IMMERSION.

In the beginning of the Christian era people resorted to the water, and never brought the water to the individuals. The first baptist spent most of his time on the banks of Jordan. Instead of choosing the dry floor of some large synagogue in Jerusalem and there administering a *rhantismos* to the people, John chose the river Jordan and there administered baptism. “There went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him *in Jordan*, confessing their sins.” Matt. 3:5, 6. Yes, *in Jordan*. But some modern folks have become so wise that they conclude the term “*in Jordan*” does not mean literally in the river, but simply somewhere in that country. This is clearly settled by one decisive text. I refer to Mark 1: 5—“And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.” They were not baptized *upon* Jordan nor *with* Jordan, nor was Jordan poured or sprinkled *upon*

them, but John actually baptized the people *in Jordan*, "*in the river of Jordan.*"

God chose and sent John to baptize. See John 1: 16, 33. His baptism was from heaven. "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." "He that sent me to baptize," said John, "said unto me," etc. Now, it follows that, since John's work and ministry was specially directed by the Lord, and God sent him to baptize, he gave him directions how and where to administer that baptism. If you have a special work to be done, a work of real importance, and you select some man to perform it, will you not give him clear instructions just how and where to do that work? Certainly. God had a special work to execute—the preparing of a people for the reception of the Messiah. That people was prepared through repentance and baptism. God chose John and sent him to accomplish that very work. He sent him to preach repentance and to baptize. Since the Lord sent John to baptize, he gave him full instructions just how and where to perform the sacred rite. Who will doubt that John did the very thing the Lord instructed him to do? He obeyed the Lord—did the thing commanded from heaven. Did John pitch his tent under a shade-tree by a spring and administer *rhantism*? Did he administer *ekcheo*—pouring—standing on the dry floor of some Jewish synagogue? Never. He baptized the people in the river of Jordan. Since, as we have clearly proved in the previous chapter, baptism means immersion,

John immersed the people in the river of Jordan. "And were being immersed by him in the Jordan River."—*Rotherham's translation*. "And were immersed by him in the river Jordan."—*Campbell's*. "They were immersed by him in the river Jordan."—*Bible Union*. "And were dipped in the Jordan River by him."—*Direct from the Greek, in Emphatic Diaglott*. His baptism was from heaven. Immersion, then, has the heavenly stamp upon it.

"And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came and were baptized." John 3: 23. This would be strange language indeed if John administered sprinkling. But John was a baptist, and not a *rhantist*. Sectarian theology teaches that John pitched his tent in Enon because there were many rivulets in that place to water the beasts. These theologians see all the dromedaries and camels of Arabia carrying the people to John's tent. That these thirsty beasts might have something to drink, humane John, they say, who always kept a little dish of water on his table to sprinkle with, pitched his tent at Enon—pitched it there for the sake, not of baptizing, but of watering the camels, donkeys, and mules. Such is the crookedness of sect Babylon in its teachings. But what is the testimony of divine truth? John *baptized* at Enon for a stated purpose, a given reason. He did not lodge there for that purpose, but baptized there for that reason. He baptized at Enon for the reason that there was *much*

water there. Dr. Adam Clark, the Methodist commentator, after speaking of the Jews' dipping themselves under the water, says, "It is probable that the rite was thus performed at Enon."

We will now consider the baptism of Jesus, our blessed example.

"Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Matt. 3:13, 17. "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens open, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him." Mark 1: 9, 10.

In reading, with unprejudiced mind, this account as recorded by Matthew and Mark, any candid person can not fail to see immersion. It is so simple and so plain that a child can understand it. Were it not for the false teachings of men, all would see the truth as it is; but in order to uphold false creeds, so-called ministers have turned the truth into a lie. They

have explained away the plain statement of the Bible.

When Jesus commissioned his ministers, as recorded in Matt. 28:19, 20 and Mark 16:15, 16, to administer a certain ordinance to the disciples made from among all nations, he employed a word to express it—baptize. Now, Christ himself has fixed, by his own act, the meaning of the word. In his baptism a certain act was performed. That very act was what he commanded. His disciples so understood it. When the word was afterwards used with reference to this ordinance, it could never have any other meaning. If Jesus was immersed, the question is decided for all time—baptism is immersion. Let us carefully examine the record.

Jesus was baptized in the river, for John at this very time was baptizing “in the river of Jordan.” See Mark 1:5, 9, 10. Mark records that Jesus “was baptized of John in Jordan.” The regular word for in is *en*, but here is *eis*—into. The Greek preposition *en* means in or within. See “Bullions’ Greek Grammar,” Page 170. “*Eis* signifies motion from without to within; hence, corresponds to the English *into*.” Jesus “was baptized of John in—Greek, *into*—the Jordan.”—*Revised Version*. “And was immersed *into* the Jordan by John.”—*Rotherham*. “Was dipped by John *into* the Jordan.”—*Direct from the Greek, Emphatic Diaglott*. “And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened.” Here we have a clear immersion. Jesus

went down to the river of Jordan, where John was baptizing. Mark 1: 5, 9. Then John baptized him *into* Jordan, and straightway—immediately—he came up out of the water.

Language could hardly be found to express more clearly the immersion of Christ, our Master. His example in this settles for all time the true and only action of baptism. Immersion, then, has the sanction of the holy Trinity. Jesus submitted to it and was immersed; the Holy Spirit approved of it and descended upon Christ when he arose out of the water; and the Father spoke from heaven and said, “I am well pleased.”

We next turn to Acts 8: 35-39. Here is recorded the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch. “And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?” “And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing.” This account is so plain that it scarcely needs comment.

The similarity between the baptism of the eunuch and that of Jesus is very marked. Philip led this convert down into the water and there baptized him. Then they both came up out of the water. How different this ancient, apostolic mode from that admin-

istered by Catholics, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Free Methodists, Congregationalists, and all the modern sects that administer the man-invented sprinkling and pouring sacraments, as they term them! Back there the minister selected a river, a pool, or some other body of water as the place to baptize; now they select a church and a small bowl of water. In those early days the minister led the candidate down into the water and baptized him; now the preacher stands on the dry floor of his beautiful meeting-house. At that time the people were buried in baptism; now a few drops are sprinkled on the hair or snapped in the face. In some of the more stylish places the hats of the proud ladies are not even removed, and only their feathers and flowers receive the sprinkles. In primitive times, after baptism, people came up out of the water; now they walk on the soft carpet to their seats. Oh, how changed! Truly, the apostasy has made void the commandments of God and substituted traditions instead. May God help every honest soul to cast away human tradition and obey the blessed old Bible. Thousands to-day are doing this.

Next we will consider the baptism of Saul, or Paul. Ananias laid his hands upon Paul and he received his sight and was filled with the Holy Ghost. After this Ananias said, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized." Acts 22: 16. And "he arose, and was baptized." Acts 9: 18. Why the necessity of arising? If Ananias had sprinkled or poured a little

water upon Paul's head, he could have done so more conveniently in the posture that Saul was when he laid his hands upon him. The words *arise* and *arose* here signify more than standing up. The prodigal son said, "I will *arise* and go to my father." "And he *arose* and came to his father." "The word *arose* . . . expresses the act of setting out, or beginning to do anything. It was a common expression among the Hebrews to denote entering upon a piece of business."—*Barnes*. Luke did not say that he "sat still" and was sprinkled, but that he "arose and was baptized," that is, he set out at once to a suitable place and was there immersed.

In the sixteenth of Acts we read that Paul and his company came to Philippi and there abode certain days. "And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river-side, where prayer was wont to be made: and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Then we have the account of the conversion of Lydia and the statement that "she was baptized, and her household." Verses 14, 15.

This was certainly a good place to preach and to impress upon Lydia's mind the importance of baptism. The preaching of the apostles and the conversion of Lydia and her household took place by a "river-side." And before leaving the river, she and her household were baptized. After this she constrained the apostles to accompany her home. Verse 15.

We now come to a clear example of immersion—

the baptism of the Philippian jailor. After many stripes had been laid on the backs of Paul and Silas, they were cast into prison, and the jailor was charged to keep them safely, "who, having received such a charge, thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks.

"And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God: and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken: and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed. And the keeper of the prison awaking out of his sleep, and seeing the prison doors open, he drew out his sword, and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had been fled. But Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, Do thyself no harm: for we are all here. Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." Acts 16: 25-34.

Let us analyze this account as far as it pertains to

baptism. We have Paul and Silas in the inner prison, or dungeon. This prison was located somewhere in or near the city of Philippi. A river ran by this city. See verses 12, 13. The ancient name of this river was Gangites; its modern name is Gangusta. See "Encyclopedia Britannica." Paul sailed from Troas up this river to Philippi. Verses 11, 12. And when he left the place, "We sailed away from Philippi," Luke says, "and came to Troas." See Acts 20:6. So the stream was large enough to sail on with boats. The house of the jailor, or keeper of the prison, joined the jail. When the earthquake occurred, the keeper of the prison awoke out of sleep, "called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, *and brought them out.*" Mark the fact, he "brought them out." So they were not baptized in the jail, as sprinklers vainly assert.

"And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." The preaching probably took place in the jailor's house. We also read that the jailor believed "in God with all his house." And the same hour of the night he washed their stripes, and was "baptized, he and all his, straight-way," as soon as it could be accomplished. After their baptism it is said, "And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them." What could be plainer? First, the jailor brought Paul and Silas out of the prison and took them into his own house. Here they preached "to all that were in his

house.” The jailor and his family believed and after this were baptized. From the place of baptism the jailor took the apostles back “into his house” again. There is no way under heaven to evade the plain truth that the jailor and his family went out of their house to be baptized and after that went back into their house.

So this baptism was not administered on the dry floor of the jail, nor in the house that joined it, but outside of both. Where did they go? To the same place where Lydia was baptized—the river.

If sprinkling or pouring was administered, why did they go outside of both house and jail to do it? Ah! Paul knew nothing of this Romish rite. It had not yet been invented. He practised what he preached. In his teaching he tells plainly what baptism consists of, and it is preposterous to say that he administered a different rite from this. Hear him: “Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so ye also should walk in newness of life.” Rom. 6:4. “Buried with him in baptism.” Col. 2:12.

In the foregoing texts the apostle alludes to the action in baptism. We must be buried in the water like one who is dead and be raised out of it like one resurrected. Every commentator and author of any note whom I have examined, including Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Doddridge, McKnight, Chalmers, Dr. Adam Clark, and a host of others, while all pedo-

baptists, agree that these texts refer to the ancient form of baptism by immersion. Sprinkling a few drops in the face is not burying in baptism, neither is pouring a little stream upon the head. Baptism is a *burial* and a *resurrection*; hence there can be but one action to represent it: that action is immersion.

Summing up all the scriptural testimony and examples referred to in this chapter, we have but one conclusion—Immersion only was the ancient mode of baptism. John the Baptist performed a certain act when he baptized the people and Jesus. When Jesus and his disciples baptized, they performed the same act. When he commanded them to baptize the Gentiles, he commanded the same act to be performed, and the apostles performed that act in obedience to his command. The same word is used; does it not mean the same thing? That meaning was forever fixed by the Savior's own example when he went down into the river and was baptized of John *into* Jordan.

THE VOICE OF HISTORY.

Though we do not rely upon history to prove what the ancient mode of baptism was, yet it may be edifying to the reader to see what historians say. I will begin with the learned and reliable historian—

MOSHEIM—"The sacrament of baptism was administered, in this [the first] century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that

purpose and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." Speaking of the second century, he says: "The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water."—*McLaines' Mosheim*.

NEANDER—In a letter to Mr. Judd, he says: "The practise of immersion was beyond doubt prevalent in the whole church."

COLEMAN, who himself opposed immersion, was compelled to admit that it was the primitive mode. I quote from his "Ancient Christianity Exemplified": "The term baptism is derived from the Greek word *bapto*, from which term is formed *baptizo*, with its derivatives *baptismos* and *baptisma*, baptism. The primary signification of the original is to dip, to plunge, immerse. The obvious import of the noun is immersion." Page 372. Now he says, "Baptism by immersion, unquestionably, was very early the common mode of baptism." "It is a great mistake to suppose that baptism by immersion was discontinued when infant baptism became generally prevalent. The practise of immersion continued even to the thirteenth or fourteenth century." Page 396.

PHILIP SCHAFF: "History of the Apostolic Church"—"Immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original normal form. This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words—*baptizo*, *baptisma*, and *baptismos*—used to designate

the rite." Page 568. He further says. "The general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, which was always immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental, and also in the Græco Russian churches, pouring and sprinkling being substituted only in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death." Schaff himself practised sprinkling.

TERTULLIAN—"We are plunged in the water."

BARNABAS—"We go down into the water."

To this list could be added *Eusebius*, *DuPin*, *Milner*, and *Waddington*, ecclesiastical historians of note, who all concur that the primitive mode of baptism was immersion. Also *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Wesley*, *Dr. Clark*, and many other such eminent reformers and commentators, who spent years in searching the pages of history, all agree that the primitive action and practise was immersion.

I will here insert the testimony of a few learned authorities.

PROFESSOR MOSES STUART, Presbyterian—"The mode of baptism by immersion, the Oriental church has always continued to preserve." "I know of no usage of ancient times, which seems to be more clearly and more certainly made out: I can not see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this." He further says, "In what manner then did the churches of Christ from a very early period (to say the least) understand the word *baptizo* in the New Testament? Plainly they construed it as meaning immersion." "We are left in

no doubt about the generally received usage of the Christian church down to a period several centuries after the apostolic age."

DR. MILLER, Presbyterian—"It is not denied that for the first few centuries after Christ, the most common mode of administering baptism was by immersion."

DR. WHITBY, Church of England—"Immersion was religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries."

THOMAS STACKHOUSE, Episcopal—"We nowhere read in the Scripture of any one's being baptized but by immersion—and several authors have proved, from the acts of councils and ancient rituals, that this manner of immersion continued as much as possible for thirteen hundred years after Christ."—*The History of the Bible*.

BISHOP TAYLOR—"The custom of the ancient churches was not sprinkling, but immersion, in pursuance of the meaning of the word baptize in the commandment and the example of our blessed Savior."

RICHARD BAXTER, author of "Saints' Rest"—"It is commonly confessed by us, . . . that in the apostles' times the baptized were dipped overhead in water."

F. BRENNER, Roman Catholic—"Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and ordinarily performed by the immersion of a man under water; and only in extraordinary cases was sprinkling or affusion permitted."—*Augusti Deukward* vii, p. 68.

Here is the uniform admission of scholars who searched the historic records. Though sprinklers themselves, they freely admit that the primitive practise was immersion and that the same continued to be the prevalent mode for thirteen hundred years after Christ. About the time of Tertullian, two heresies were introduced; namely, trine immersion, and sprinkling and pouring as substitutes for baptism in case of sickness and approaching death.

OBJECTIONS TO IMMERSION CONSIDERED.

It is objected by those who practise sprinkling and pouring that John could not possibly have immersed all the thousands who came to his baptism. They count up all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, of Judea, and of all the region round about Jordan, and find that they numbered over a million people, and then conclude that John could not have immersed them all.

To this we reply: The Bible does not say that the entire population of these places was baptized. It just mentions the places from which the people went. We say that the President of the United States made a great speech at Harrisburg and that all Pennsylvania was there to hear him. Do we mean that every man, woman, and child in the State was there? Certainly not, but that some were present from every part of the State. So when John baptized in Jordan, Jerusalem came—that is, people from Jerusalem—

and all the land of Judea—that is people from every part of that country—and others from all the region round about Jordan.

But John did not even baptize nearly all the people that came to him. A great multitude came, among whom were Pharisees and Sadducees, and he called them a generation of vipers and told them that they must first bring forth fruits meet for repentance. See Matt. 3:7, 8; Luke 3:7, 8. This they never did; for when Jesus appeared a little later, they rejected him. So large numbers came to John for baptism whom he rejected. But all that repented he baptized. As to the number whom he baptized the Bible is silent.

One thing is clearly stated—they “were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan.” Mark 1:5. One minister said in my presence, “John stood in the river, and as the people came marching down along the shore in pairs, he took a bunch of hyssop and sprinkled them dozens at a time.” This may sound ridiculous, but I want to show the inconsistency of those who oppose Christian baptism. Those who have invented substitutes for baptism certainly are hard pressed for argument.

Again, it is objected that John baptized “in Bethabara beyond Jordan” (John 1:28) and that “John did baptize in the wilderness.” Mark 1:4. Dr. Adam Clark, in his commentary, says, “Bethabara signifies literally, *the house of passage*; and is thought to be the place where the Israelites passed the river

Jordan, under Joshua." Bethabara was but a ford, or ferry-house, on the east bank of the Jordan. John simply baptized the people at this place. While most of his baptizing was done on the side of Jordan next to Jerusalem, there were some people over in the wilderness, which to the Jews meant simply a sparsely settled country around the ferry-house of Bethabara on the opposite bank of Jordan, or "beyond" Jordan from Jerusalem, and John went to that side of the river and baptized the people. He baptized them "in Jordan" (Matt. 3:6), not out in the dry country, as false teachers assert.

But it is asserted that John could not have dipped the people into Jordan; for he said, "I indeed baptize you *with* water" (Matt. 3:11) and Jesus himself said, "John *truly* baptized *with* water." Acts 1:5. This "rhantizers" consider their Gibraltar; "for," say they, "it clearly implies that John applied the water to the individual, and not the individual to the water." This, indeed, to some has a show of argument in it; but when the texts are carefully examined, they prove no such thing. Read the context. The question was not the mode of application, but the element used. The element in John's baptism was water, and the element Jesus was to use was the Holy Spirit. John's baptism was not with oil, or milk, or mud, or the Holy Spirit, but with water—that was the element used. Jesus was to baptize the people with another element—the Holy Ghost. Does the word *with*, then, fix the mode of administration,

or express the element used? It expresses only the element used in each baptism. Let me give a few examples of its use:

My coat was dyed, or colored, *with* logwood. To accomplish this, it was *dipped* into the liquid. I simply mean that it was not dipped into indigo or some other dyestuff. Logwood was the element used. Of a piece of leather received from a certain tannery I say, This leather was tanned *with* oak. The leather was dipped into the infusion to accomplish this. I mean that the element used was not hemlock or some other material; it was oak.

John baptized the people with water, and to accomplish it, took them into the river Jordan and dipped them. Just so people to-day wash their clothes *with* water and in doing this, dip the garments into the liquid. So were we to admit that *with* is a proper translation, the evidences would favor immersion. But, beloved reader, the word *with* in these texts is from the Greek word *en*. The primary and ordinary meaning of the preposition *en* is in or within. (See Bullions' Greek Grammar, page 170.)

This same word *en* is translated in twenty-five hundred times in the New Testament in our common version. Think of it! In twenty-five hundred other places the King James committee correctly rendered the Greek word *en* by in; but when they came to baptism, they rendered *en* with. The reason is clear. These sprinklers were forbidden by King James to

change ecclesiastical words. Therefore they did not translate *baptizo*, but transferred it and rendered *en* by the word with.

But any candid mind can see that if *en* means in in twenty-five hundred other places, it means in here. For example, I will select Matthew third chapter. "In—*en*—those days came John the Baptist preaching in—*en*—the wilderness of Judea." Verse 1. "The voice of one crying in—*en*— the wilderness." Verse 3. "And were baptized of him in—*en* —Jordan." Verse 6. "Think not within — *en* — yourselves." Verse 9. "I indeed baptize you with —*en*—water." Verse 11. "Whose fan is in—*en*— his hand." Verse 12. The same word is used in all these texts. Five times it is translated in, once within, and once with. You can see at a glance that its true meaning is in or within.

To make this still clearer, let us substitute with for in. "With those days came John the Baptist preaching with the wilderness of Judea." "Crying with the wilderness." "Baptized of him with Jordan." "Whose fan is with his hand." Ah! there is no sense in this reading. It must be in. "I indeed baptize you in water." "I indeed dip you in water."—*Direct from the Greek in the Emphatic Diaglott.*

But to settle the point beyond all question that John baptized in water, I quote three texts: "And were baptized of him in Jordan." Matt. 3: 6. "And were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan."

Mark 1:5. Jesus “was baptized of John in—*eis*, into—Jordan.” Mark 1:9.

Another argument is brought forth against immersion—the impossibility of baptizing three thousand on the day of Pentecost. Acts 2:41. Sprinklers say that it could not have been done. Their two main hobbies are these: Not water enough; not time enough. In reply to this I would say: The Bible says that they were baptized. We have abundantly proved that baptize means to dip, or immerse; therefore there must have been both water enough and time enough.

To say that there was not water enough is to manifest extreme ignorance. Jerusalem was the city where the Jews from all over the land resorted to offer sacrifices and to worship. During their great feasts hundreds of thousands came to worship. Their Temple was here. As all acquainted with Bible teaching and the facts of history know, the religious ceremonies of this people required their frequent ablutions, and therefore they must have made abundant provisions for bathing. Yes, nearly every house had a cistern for this purpose. Then think of the many great pools and reservoirs in and about the city—Pool of Siloam, Pool of Bethesda, Upper Pools, Lower Pools, many large reservoirs fed from Solomon’s great pools beyond Bethlehem. Right outside the city walls were two immense pools, one nearly six hundred feet long by over two hundred feet wide and another over three hundred feet long.

Inside the city were two pools each over two hundred feet long by nearly two hundred feet wide. Thousands of Jews bathed in some of these pools. Jerusalem was the best-watered city in the world. So all the talk about there not being water enough is only "idle words," of which men will have to give an account in the day of judgment. But it is objected that the bitter Jews would not allow the Christians the use of these bathing-pools. To this I reply, God gave them "favor with all the people." Acts 2:17. They had the temple to preach in and the use of the pools for baptism.

The last prop is, "not enough time." I am confident that a person could immerse very nearly as many people as he could sprinkle or pour in the same time, since he would repeat the same formula. The twelve apostles could have baptized by immersion three thousand people in about five hours' time. But since Jesus had called seventy others—and evidently they were all present—there were at least eighty-two ordained ministers present on this occasion. These could have immersed three thousand in about one hour's time, taking for each one the time usually consumed to-day, as there would have been only thirty-seven persons to each minister. There is nothing in this against New Testament immersion.

But the Israelites "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. 10:2), "and the clouds poured out water." Psa. 77:17. This is considered by some a strong proof against immer-

sion. But where, I ask, is the proof? The thunder, the lightning, the trembling of the earth, and the clouds pouring out their water, referred to by David, was against, not the Israelites, but the Egyptians. There is no proof here. The Jews received no sprinkling. They went through "dry." At most, this baptism was but figurative, not a wetting. The Israelites went down into the sea, as one goes down into the water to be baptized. The waters stood in mighty banks on each side of them. A cloud of glory was before them, a cloud of darkness behind them, and a great cloud covered them from above. They were completely hidden and enveloped by the cloud and the sea. Thus, figuratively speaking, they were baptized in the cloud and in the sea.

The last point worthy of notice is the objection presented on the word *into*. In answering the plain statement that Philip and the eunuch both *went down into the water* and after Philip had baptized the eunuch, *came up out of the water*, those who practise sprinkling and pouring say that *into* does not mean literally in, but just close by or near to. They just went down from the carriage to the water and then walked away from it. This is certainly strained reasoning in order to evade the plain truth. Let us test their assertion and see the deception in it. In the third chapter of Daniel we read that Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego "were cast into the burning fiery furnace." Verse 21. Now, if *into* does not mean literally in, but just close by or near

to, these Hebrews, after all, were not in the fire, but just close by or near enough to be comfortable! Then again, in Dan. 6:16 we read that they "brought Daniel and cast him into the den of lions." You see, according to this modern theology, Daniel was never really in with the lions, but just near the place, probably sitting outside watching these ferocious beasts!

This certainly opens a fine door for these religious infidels—sect preachers—who can not believe the story of Jonah. The Bible says of Jonah that they took him "and cast him forth *into* the sea." Jonah 1:15. "And Jonah was *in* the belly of the fish three days and three nights." Verse 17. For some time it has been hard for the preachers of sect Babylon to believe this story. In their higher schools of criticism they pronounce it a fable. In several large conferences they have unanimously decided that the whole thing is fiction. But here is something that lets them out. Into and in do not mean literally in, but just close by. So Jesus was mistaken when he said, "Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly." Matt. 12:40. According to this new theology, he was only near by. Probably, as an old German brother expressed it, "He just jumped on the back of the fish and rode ashore."

"The wicked shall be turned *into* hell, and all the nations that forget God." Psalms 9:17. In the great day of judgment Jesus will say, "Depart from me,

ye cursed, *into* everlasting fire." Matt. 25:41. "Cast ye the unprofitable servant *into* outer darkness." Matt. 25:30. "And the devil that deceived them was cast *into* the lake of fire and brimstone." Rev. 20:10. You see, if *into* only means close by or near to, the Bible, after all, is a book of falsehood, and the devil and wicked men will really never literally go into the lake of fire, but will only be close by it somewhere.

If this be really true, there is certainly a sad page to it. The Christians' hope of heaven would all be forever blasted. For we read, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates *into* the city." Rev. 22:14. "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly *into* the everlasting kingdom." 2 Pet. 1:11. Can it be that, after all, we shall be privileged only to get close by or near heaven—never really enter in? If sprinklers' logic is true, we may well despair of heaven. But thank God! their argument is false from the ground up. Just as sure as the Hebrews were literally in the fiery furnace, and Daniel was in the lions' den, and Jonah was in the whale's belly, and the wicked shall wail in hell, and the blood-washed millions shall dwell in heaven, so sure did Philip baptize the eunuch in the water, for they both went down into the stream or pond. So this baptism, as well as that of Jesus, was administered literally in the water.

SPRINKLING NOT BAPTISM.

This has already been clearly proved in a previous chapter. The Greek word for sprinkle is *raino*; for sprinkling, *rhantismos*. Had sprinkling been the action or mode that Jesus intended in this Christian rite, he would have chosen *raino* and *rhantismos* to express it, these being specific words with but one meaning—to sprinkle or sprinkling. Not in a single text in the whole New Testament that refers to this ceremony can the words *raino* or *rhantismos* be found in the original manuscripts, nor in any English version can the words sprinkle and sprinkling be found in any text bearing on the subject. This is an overwhelming truth. It forever refutes the idea that sprinkling is baptism. There is no appeal from it. Jesus selected instead the specific word that means to dip, or immerse—*baptizo*. Since sprinkle can not be dip, nor immerse, sprinkle, *raino* can not be *baptizo*, nor *baptismos*, a *rhantismos*. Sprinkling can not be baptism.

I will now consider the texts generally referred to by those who practise sprinkling.

“So shall he sprinkle many nations.” Isa. 52: 15. On this I will remark: There is no reference to any rite to be administered by men. The text has direct reference to Christ. “His visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of man: so shall he sprinkle many nations.” The marring of his visage and form was by pressing the thorns on his brow, by laying stripes upon his back,

by driving nails into his hands and feet, and by piercing his side with the spear. Thus his blood was spilled; thus he made an atonement for sin; and thus he sprinkles the nations. By the marring of his form and visage in suffering and death, he sprinkles the nations to-day. It is "the blood of sprinkling" (Heb. 12:24), "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 1:2), "our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." Heb. 10:22. There is not the slightest reference in the text to water baptism.

Next let us consider Ezek. 36:25, 26—"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you." To say that the prophet here had reference to the New Testament rite of baptism, is absurd. Literal water sprinkled upon an individual could never effect a moral cleansing and change such as described in this text. The sprinkling of this water was to cleanse from all filthiness and from all idols and to give to men a new heart. Water is used in Scripture as a symbol of salvation (Isa. 12:3), peace (Isa. 66:12), pleasures (Psa. 36:8), gladness (Psa. 46:4), the Holy Spirit (John 7:37-39) and the word of God or the gospel. John 15:13; Eph. 5:26. A clear reading of the context shows that the prophet was foretelling the cleansing effects of the gospel. "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." John 15:3. "Cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Eph. 5:26.

The great laver, or sea, at the door of Solomon's temple, was placed on the backs of the similitude of twelve oxen, with their heads pointed in every direction. Those oxen typified the new testament ministry; the laver of water typified the cleansing gospel. Thus, the ministers bear the gospel north, east, south, and west to every nation. God uses them as humble instruments to sprinkle his gracious truth upon the people. "Clean water" means a clean gospel, and the result is a clean people. "Ye shall be clean."

One more point worthy of note is the *quantity of water*. Sprinklers say that water alone does not constitute baptism; that it takes the Word of God in connection with water to make Christian baptism; and that, hence, a few drops with the Word is as good as an ocean. This to them seems a strong and unanswerable argument. But let us examine. Baptism expresses an act. That action must be performed, or there is no baptism. Christian baptism, then, is the performance of a certain action in connection with the Word of truth. What is that action? One text answers it—"Buried with him in baptism." Col. 2:12. You see, the point is not so much in the quantity of water as it is in the act performed. One minister stands on the dry carpeted floor of his beautiful church and with a little dish or bowl in his hand sprinkles a few drops on the head of a crying baby. Another minister leads down into the water a converted believer and there im-

merges him, gently burying him beneath the wave and then lifting him up out of the water again. Do these two ministers perform the same act? "No" is the immediate answer of every intelligent person. One administers *rhantism* on a dry floor, and the other baptizes in the water.

I boldly make the statement without fear of contradiction, that sprinkling just common water upon anybody for any purpose was never commanded by God in any dispensation. Such a thing was never practised in the Patriarchal or Jewish age. It has no authority in the New Testament; there is not a text to support it. Therefore its practise is without the authority of God. It is of human invention; it originated in the Mother of Harlots—Roman Catholicism—during the dark ages. Protestants have brought the rite out of Rome and still continue to practise it.

THE ARGUMENTS OF THOSE WHO POUR REFUTED.

The original word for pour is *ekcheo*. Had Jesus intended pour to express the action of this new covenant rite, he certainly would have selected the specific word *ekcheo* when he gave the great commission that reaches all nations; but in not one text in the New Testament which refers to water baptism can *ekcheo* be found in any manuscript, nor pour in

any English version. This being true, we can draw but one conclusion—Pouring is not baptism.

But it is argued thus: Everywhere in the prophecies and in the New Testament the Holy Spirit is said to be *poured out* upon the people, and both John the Baptist and Jesus calls this baptism. “Baptized with the Holy Ghost.” Therefore, since the pouring out of the Holy Spirit is termed a baptism, pouring must be baptism and the true mode. To many this seems a very plausible conclusion. They say that since the Spirit baptism is pouring, the water baptism must be pouring, too; for the one is but the outward sign of the other.

Let us carefully examine this matter. It is worthy of consideration. Four times in the prophecies it was mentioned that in the Christian era the Spirit would be poured out upon the people. Isa. 44:3; Isa 32:15; Joel 2:28; Joel 2:29. In fulfilment we have the expression, Holy Ghost poured out, three times in the New Testament. Acts 2:17; 2:18; 10:45.

Was this pouring a literal pouring out, or just a figurative expression of the shedding forth of the mighty influences of the Holy Spirit? The Holy Spirit is a person, the third person in the Trinity. He is the sanctifier of the church. Rom. 15:16. While he personally comes into our hearts as an abiding Comforter, he envelopes us, covers us, overwhelms us in and by his gracious influences, and into him we are completely submerged. These may be said to be poured upon us in such copiousness that we are

completely submerged; and this submerging is figuratively termed baptism.

In Matt. 20: 22, 23 Jesus speaks of his sufferings, sorrows, and deep affliction, and calls them baptism. He told James and John that they must be baptized with the same baptism. This was not a literal baptism. The term baptism is here used in a figurative sense. Jesus was overwhelmed in sorrow, submerged in suffering, immersed in deep affliction. So with the Holy Spirit. The pouring out of the Holy Ghost was not the baptism. The baptism was the result of that pouring out. Such an abundance of the Spirit and its influences were to be shed forth that believers would be completely submerged—immersed—right into them. To illustrate: Were it possible to stand beside a great falls like Niagara and dip a person into the falling water until he was entirely submerged, or buried from view, he would be baptized just as much as if he had been buried in the stream below.

“Ye shall be immersed—*en*—in the Holy Ghost.” This is the correct rendering. This is a baptism of the soul, not of the body. The souls of the believers were to be immersed in the life, joy, light, glory, power, and gracious influences of the Spirit, which, like a flood, would be poured upon them from on high.

I will recite a few authorities selected from A. Campbell in his discussion with N. L. Rice. These authorities are all non-immersionists.

GURTERUS—“Baptism in the Holy Spirit, is immersion in the pure waters of the Holy Spirit: or a

rich and abundant communication of his gift. For he on whom the Holy Spirit is poured out is, as it were, immersed into him."

REYNOLDS—"The Spirit, under the gospel, is compared to water; and that not a little measure, to sprinkle or bedew, but to baptize the faithful in (Matt. 3. 11; Acts 1:5): and that not in a font, or vessel, which grows less and less, but in a spring or living water."

LECLERE—"He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit. As I plunge you in water, he shall plunge you, so to speak, in the Holy Spirit."

CASAUBON—"To baptize is to immerse, and in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized; for the house in which this was done was filled with the Holy Ghost, so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it as into a fishpool."

LEIGH—"Baptized; that is, drown you all over, dip you into the ocean of his grace."

TILLOTSON—"It filled all the house. That is that which our Savior calls baptizing with the Holy Ghost. So that they who sat in the house were, as it were, immersed in the Holy Ghost, as they who were buried under water were overwhelmed and covered all over with water, which is the proper notion of baptism."

BISHOP HOPKINS—"Those that are baptized with the Spirit are, as it were, plunged into the heavenly flame whose searching energy devours all their dross."

CYRIL, OF JERUSALEM, FOURTH CENTURY—"As he

who plunged in water and baptized, is encompassed by the water on every side; so are they that are wholly baptized by the Spirit. . . . They were perfectly baptized, or immersed of him.”

Pouring is not baptism. We are immersed into the Holy Spirit and his gracious influences.

TRINE IMMERSION IS WITHOUT SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY.

Trine immersion means three immersions. *Tri*, *trine*, and *triune* mean three. The question, then, is this: Are three immersions essential to Christian baptism? Does the Bible teach one action, or three?

If the Lord had intended three immersions, he certainly would have said so in clear, unmistakable language. When repeated action was necessary, it was always so stated by giving the numerals. “*Three times* in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God.” Deut. 16:16. “The priest . . . shall sprinkle of the blood *seven times* before the Lord.” Lev. 4:6. 17. “And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar *seven times*.” Lev. 8:11. “*Three times* shalt thou keep a feast unto me in the year.” Exod. 23:14. These are but a few examples of many. Now, it follows that had the Lord intended people to be baptized—immersed—three times, he would have said *three times*; but nowhere in the Book, either in command or in practise, can we find three times.

The leading argument to sustain three dips is

founded on the structure of the language that constitutes the formula for baptizing, found in the commission as recorded in Matt. 28:19. If three immersions are not found or taught in the commission, then trine immersion falls to the ground. There is not a shadow of proof elsewhere. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." It is asserted that the words, "and baptizing them in the name of the Son and baptizing them in the name of the Holy Ghost," should be supplied, but this is incorrect. The ellipses to be supplied are, "and (in the name) of the Son, and (in the name) of the Holy Ghost." When the words *baptizing them* are inserted, too much is added. But the question is this: Does the repetition of the phrase *and of* in this text imply a repetition in the action of the verb? I affirm that it does not. I will give some clear examples.

"Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples." Matt. 23:1. Did Christ here deliver two sermons—one to the multitude and another to the disciples? Or did he repeat the same discourse to his disciples after delivering it to the multitude? "No," common sense answers. Yet if the construction of Matt. 28:19 teaches the repetition of action, then so does that of this text. If it does not here, it does not in the commission.

"The Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron." Num. 4:1. According to trine immersionists, there was a repetition here. He spoke first to Moses and

afterwards the same thing to Aaron. On just such absurdity rests their arguments.

“And all were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” 1 Cor. 10: 2. Was there a repetition here? No; this figurative baptism of Israel in the cloud and in the sea all took place at the same time.

“For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father’s, and of the holy angels.” Luke 9: 26. Here is a text just like the commission—an elliptical sentence. The sentence to be complete must have the word glory repeated. “When he shall come in the glory of himself and in the [glory] of the Father, and in the [glory] of the holy angels.” But the method of true immersionists in supplying the ellipses would make it read, “When he shall come in his own glory, and shall come again in his Father’s glory, and shall come a third time in the glory of his holy angels.” If there are three immersions taught in the commission, there are three comings of Christ taught in this text. If repetition of the action of the verb is implied, there must be three advents of Christ. But ah! right here their doctrine falls to the ground. There is but one action in the verb, though a repetition of the conjunction and the preposition. There is but *one* coming in *three glories*, and but *one* immersion in *three names*.

“And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham,

and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.” Matt. 8:11. Repetition of action would require three sittings. In the commission it is argued that there are three characters distinguished by the three names, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that since there are three characters, there must be a repetition of action, three immersions. But this reasoning is not sound. In the text above there is a clear distinction between the three persons, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. According to trine immersionists, then, there must be three sittings; those coming from the east and the west sit down three times. They must first sit down with Abraham; then get up and sit down with Isaac; then rise again and sit down the third time with Jacob. No one except trine immersionists understands language so, and they nowhere but in the commission. This text is fatal to their doctrine. Its construction is parallel with the construction of Matt. 28:19, and there is no repetition of action. There is but *one* sitting down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob.

“To the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.” Col. 2:2. If trine immersionists’ method of interpretation be correct, then we have in this text three mysteries and three acknowledgments — “The acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and [the acknowledgment of the mystery] of the Father, and [the acknowledgment of the mystery] of Christ.” Who so understands language? There is but *one* mystery. Every-

body so understands it. Then, there is but one immersion. The structure of the language in both texts is the same.

“I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” 1 Thess. 5:23. Do we understand that there are three actions here—three distinct preservings? No one believes it. The Bible nowhere justifies such interpretation.

I have given a number of texts where the construction of the language is parallel with that of the commission, and not in a single one of them is there a repetition of action. This being true, it follows that the doctrine of trine immersion built on the language of the commission is without Scriptural warrant or authority.

Trine immersionists quote the following texts to prove repeated action. “And Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the temple.” Mark 11:11. Two enterings. “And told in the city, and in the country.” Mark 5:14. Two tellings. To this I reply that the texts and the cases are not parallel. These texts are not similar in their construction, and the cases to which they refer are not similar in their nature. The city and the country were not identical places, and the temple and Jerusalem were not identical places. But the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are “one God,” into whom there is but one entering—one induction.

Whether or not the apostles understood that Jesus

intended the exact words of Matt. 28:19 to be used as a formula in administering baptism, the record of their practise is: "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." Acts 2:38. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts 10:48. "They were all baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 8:16. "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 19:5. But it is objected that the words "in the name of Jesus" in these texts simply mean by his authority; that in Matt. 28:19 *eis* is used, which means *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. So they conclude that trine immersion was administered in the name, or by the authority, of Jesus Christ. In Acts 8:16 and Acts 19:5 the original word is *eis*—into. Both texts read: "Baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus."—*Revised Version*. "Immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus."—*Emphatic Diaglott*, *Rotherham*, and other versions. These two texts alone overthrow all the false theories of trine immersionists. They prove clearly that single immersion was the apostolic practise. Mark that the apostles baptized believers *into* the name of the Lord Jesus. And "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9. Now, since the fulness of the Godhead—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—all dwell in Christ, and it requires but one act to induct us into Christ, and one act inducts us into his name, then it follows that one act inducts us into the entire Godhead.

The Dunkard people hold that water baptism is the door into the church. They also hold that it takes three distinct immersions to induct people into the Trinity. One immersion inducts us into the Father, the second into the Son, and the third into the Holy Spirit. Thus, they teach three distinct inductions into the Godhead. Oh, the blindness of such teaching! It involves them in this difficulty: If the first dip inducts them into the Father, and not into the Son nor into the Holy Spirit, then should they never receive a second dip, they would never be in Christ or his name. Who can conceive of one's being in God and not in Christ, especially since Jesus said: "No man can come to the Father but by me"; "I am in the Father, and the Father in me" (John 14:9, 11); "I and my Father are one" (John 10:30)? "These three are one." 1 John 5:7. The same act that brings a person into the Son brings him into the Father; and the same is true of the Holy Spirit.

If, as John Wesley said, "Baptism is an outward sign of an inward work," then single immersion fills the requirement of the commission perfectly. Let us examine carefully. In Christ dwells all the fulness of the Godhead substantially. Christ is in the Father, and the Father in him. Then, it follows that one act in his name includes the Father and the Holy Spirit. "Whatsoever ye do in word and deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." Col. 3:17. To immerse in the name of the Father exclusive of

the name of the Son is unscriptural. But the fact is, it is impossible to act in the name of one person in the Trinity and not in the name of the other two. "These three are one." One God—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. When the apostles immersed believers into the name of the Lord Jesus, that one act immersed them into the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit.

It might be well right here to explain in what sense we are immersed into his name in water baptism. Peter says, "Eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us." 1 Pet. 3:20, 21. Baptism is a figurative salvation. The saving of eight souls in the ark during the flood was a figure of our salvation; and Peter plainly tells us that baptism is a "like figure." Figurative means emblematical. Our induction into Christ, into his name, is wrought by the Holy Spirit. It is a work of God, and not of man. By a work of divine grace the soul is baptized into Christ and at the same time into his name and into the kingdom of heaven. This is a spiritual work. Now, water baptism is an emblem of this inward work, an outward testimony to the fact that we have died to sin and have been resurrected to walk in newness of life. It is a figurative induction into Christ. In baptism we publicly confess his name, take upon us his name before the world, and thus emblematically are baptized into his name.

Since baptism is but an outward mark, or testi-

mony—a figure—it must agree with the thing it symbolizes. Mark well this point, for it completely overthrows the doctrine of trine immersion.

1. *Our induction into Christ.* How many acts are there when the soul is inducted into Christ? On our part—one act of faith. “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” Does it require three distinct acts of faith on the part of a penitent to induct him into Christ? No; only one act is required. So in the symbol—baptism—there should be but one action. On the Lord’s part. Does it require three separate, distinct actions of the Holy Spirit to place us into the body of Christ? No. Just one act of the Spirit of God grafts us into the true vine. One action in baptism publicly testifies this blessed truth. A repetition of action would testify a lie.

2. *Spiritual birth.* We enter the kingdom of grace, are brought forth into a new world, through spiritual birth. This spiritual birth is symbolized by the rite of water baptism. Now I ask in all candor, How many times must we be born again to become the sons of God? How many births does it require? “Only one,” is the answer of all enlightened persons. Only one fleshly birth is necessary in order to enter this natural world, and but one spiritual birth in order to enter the spiritual world, or kingdom. One immersion perfectly symbolizes this birth.

If trine immersion is orthodox, then there are three births of the Spirit before we become the children of

God; but the fact that one spiritual birth makes us members of God's family proves trine immersion heterodox. Let me illustrate. I live in the State of Pennsylvania. A child is born into my family. That child is born into the world, into the United States, and into the State of Pennsylvania. Does this require three births—first, into the world; second, into the Union; and third, into the State? No; one birth accomplishes the whole. God the Father, Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit are so associated that in Christ dwells the entire fulness of the Godhead bodily. Therefore one act—one spiritual birth—must bring us into relationship with all. Thank God, it does. Baptism, being a public testimony of this fact, requires but one literal action, one immersion.

Peter says (1 Pet. 3:20, 21) that water baptism is a “like figure” with the saving of Noah and his family, to our salvation; that is, the saving of eight souls back there was a beautiful figure of our salvation in Christ, and water baptism is also a figure, a similar figure. In the first, what have we? Just one ark, one entering in, one flood, one salvation. The things prefigured are: one Christ, our ark of safety; one entering into his kingdom; one great salvation from sin and eternal death. One immersion testifying this glorious fact is a beautiful symbol of the same.

3. *Our quickening into life.* “Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him

through the faith of the operation of God." Col. 2:12. In baptism we bear public testimony to several things. One of these glorious things is our spiritual resurrection from the dead. Every man in sin is declared to be dead, "dead in trespasses and in sins." The work of salvation is an actual raising from the dead. The present trumpet of truth sounds forth to every sinner, "Awake, thou that sleepeth, and arise from the dead." Eph. 5:14. The moment such accept salvation they pass from death unto life (1 John 3:14), are really raised up to sit in heavenly places. Eph. 2:6. This is the first resurrection. How beautifully in baptism we testify before the world this truth—when beneath the water, the fact that we were once dead; when raised out of it, the fact that we are now risen with him through faith. Now I ask, How many resurrections from the dead are there to bring a sinner from death to life? Only one—one quickening by the Spirit of God. One resurrection abolishes death and brings the soul into the life and the light of God. Since baptism is an outward sign of this fact, there can be but one action, one rising out of the water. Trine immersion destroys the purpose for which baptism was instituted.

4. *Our death to sin.* "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father,

even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom. 6:3-5. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." 1 Cor. 12:13. In conversion we are baptized by the Holy Spirit into Christ, and thus into death. We must die to sin.

Jesus said, 'Take up thy cross, and follow me.' "For he that loseth his life shall save it." Jesus carried his literal cross to the place of execution and was nailed upon it; it was planted in the earth, and there he died. So must we take up the cross in a spiritual sense, bear it, be nailed upon it, have it planted like Jesus' cross, and upon it die. This takes place in conversion. "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." Gal. 6:14. "I am crucified with Christ." Gal. 2:20. "We have been planted in the likeness of his death." All this refers to our real death to sin and the world, and to our induction by the Spirit into Christ. "Therefore [or because of this] we are buried with him by baptism into death." Baptism is a public testimony that we are dead to sin and the world. People when ready for burial are dead. It is not customary to bury living persons. Having already died to sin and "been planted in the likeness of his death," crucified, we come to the water and are there buried in baptism into death—a figurative death. This is a

beautiful symbol of our inward condition through salvation.

Our death to sin and quickening into life is very closely allied with Christ's death and resurrection. It is said to be "in the *likeness* of his death" and "in the *likeness* of his resurrection." That means similar to it, resembling it. How, then, did he die? "He died unto sin *once*." Rom. 6; 10. So in conversion there is one death to sin and one quickening into spiritual life. Baptism, being the outward sign of this death, must agree with the thing it symbolizes. Hence, one death and one burial in baptism. If trine immersion is true, there must be three deaths and three quickenings into life. The doctrine is preposterous in the extreme.

5. *Christ's death and resurrection.* A careful reading of Rom. 6:4 clearly brings out the fact that in baptism there is a similarity to the death and the resurrection of Christ. The great atonement comprehends Christ's death and resurrection. This is the foundation of our hope, the hub and center of all redemptory blessings. Everything in the Christian arrangement points to the death of Jesus and to his glorious resurrection. In baptism we are buried in the liquid symbolic grave, as Jesus was buried in the earth; then we are raised up again, just as Christ was raised triumphant from the tomb. Thus we witness to the world of sinners, to the skeptic, to our brethren in Christ, our faith in the death and the resurrection of our glorious Lord.

While in the communion supper we show his death and in the observance of the Lord's day we celebrate his resurrection, in baptism we publicly testify in symbol our unwavering faith in both. Now mark the facts—Christ died but once; he was buried but once; and but once was he resurrected from the dead. So in baptism we are buried once and but once are raised from the watery grave.

6. *Our future resurrection.* “Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?” 1 Cor. 15:29. Some of the Corinthians, it seems, were led to believe that there would be no future resurrection of the dead. In this chapter Paul brings forth some powerful arguments to convince them of this truth. In this text he refers them to the rite of baptism. They had already been baptized. Baptism, including as it does a burial and a resurrection, testifies that there is such a thing. He here refers them to the fact that they had all testified to this truth. But “if the dead rise not at all,” why be baptized for the dead? why in figure testify to a thing that never shall be? Ah! he thus showed them the folly of their false idea of no resurrection. The truth is, in baptism we publicly witness our belief in the final resurrection of the dead. Only in single immersion can we consistently testify this truth. We bury our dead but once. There will be but one resurrection from the dead. Trine immersionists, to be consistent, should bury

their dead once, then take them out of the grave, bury them a second time, take them up again, and bury them a third time for the final resurrection. This would be repetition of action, the very thing for which they contend. But even in this there would be but one real resurrection—the final. We bury our dead once; they will be resurrected but once. So in baptism, there is but one burial, one raising up.

From whatever standpoint trine immersion is considered, it destroys the object and purpose of baptism and is contrary to all the plain teachings of Scripture. There is one induction into the kingdom of grace, which brings us in touch with the whole Trinity; one spiritual birth; one spiritual resurrection; one death to the world and our sins; one death of Jesus on the cross; one burial in Joseph's tomb; one resurrection from the dead; one future resurrection when Jesus comes. The figure Jesus chose to publicly testify all this is certainly a fitting one; namely, one immersion.

Trine immersionists' doctrine is contradictory in itself. They immerse once in the name of the Father, exclusive of the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; once in the name of the Son, exclusive of the Father and the Holy Ghost; and once in the name of the Holy Ghost, exclusive of the Father and Son. If they then take the ground that they do not administer each dip exclusive of the other two names in the trinity, they drop the bottom

clear out of their whole doctrine; for to admit this is to admit the one action is baptism in the name of the Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

One argument brought forth is this: Baptism is a symbol of the Trinity. But their bare assertion is all the proof there is. In not one place in the Good Book do we read a line that even hints at such aⁿ thing. The true Bible symbol in baptism is a burial. Col. 2:12; Rom. 6:4. Who bury their dead three times?

Those who practise trine immersion do not immerse the candidate thrice, anyway. The head receives three dips, while the remainder of the body is immersed but once.

Carefully read the New Testament accounts of each baptism administered, and where is the evidence for three immersions? There is none. Jesus our example went down into the water and was immersed by John. But there is not a hint that he was repeatedly dipped into the Jordan River. There is not a single example of trine immersion in the New Testament. The only proof is the structure of the language of the commission as recorded in Matt. 28:19, 20. Here the advocates of three dips base all their hopes. But as we have abundantly proved, the language of the commission gives no authority whatever for such a belief. There is not a single precept or example from the apostles. In several texts where the language is just like that of the commission, we have seen that there is no repetition

of action. So there can be but one conclusion—Trine immersion is without Scriptural authority.

“But,” say they, “history is all on our side.” This has been one of the main pleas of trine immersionists. They claim that the testimony of history proves their practise to be the apostolic mode. To this I reply: Every stream has a beginning, a fountainhead. As we follow the stream of historical evidence favorable to trine immersion from the present time back through the centuries, it narrows down and becomes smaller and smaller, until, finally, we come to its fountain—a spring of erroneous teaching which sprang up during the life of Tertullian, who was born A. D. 204. This is the farthest back that the practise can be traced by history. There is no stream of historical testimony, however small, beyond Tertullian. As you start from a distant point toward a city, the road becomes more distinct, more traveled, broader and wider as you approach its terminus. How different with trine immersion! As the traveler meanders his way back the pathway of history, the road becomes less distinguishable, until it narrows down in the third century to a very small path and then ends about two hundred years this side of the great commission as given by Jesus Christ. Tertullian first mentions it.

Right at the time of Tertullian some of the grossest errors were introduced, and many corruptions swept over the church. Infant baptism, infant communion, exorcists employed in baptism, and

many other unauthorized and unscriptural ceremonies had begun to cluster around this sacred ordinance. See "Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History." It is clear to my mind that trine immersion was one of the very errors that here crept in and was first introduced at that time.

Tertullian, who is the first to mention trine immersion, says of it: "To deal with this matter briefly, I shall begin with baptism. When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil, and his pomp, and his angels. Hereupon we are thrice immersed, making a somewhat ampler pledge that the Lord has appointed in the gospel."—*The Crown*, Chap. 3. In this there is nothing in favor of the orthodoxy of trine immersion; for although it states that trine immersion was practised in Tertullian's time, it shows very clearly that Tertullian understood that the gospel demanded a pledge of loyalty to God in single immersion only. He plainly says that by being thrice immersed they were making "a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the gospel."

"Such language seems to convey to our mind the thought that trine immersion was then a newly gotten up invention. It also shows a greater degree of honesty than the modern propagators of the trine-immersion theory exhibit: for they will not, like Tertullian, acknowledge that three dips make an

ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the gospel.

“But we are not as yet ready to admit that the trine immersion mentioned by Tertullian was practised by the orthodox body, because Tertullian was a heretic (Montanist) a great part of his life, and his work on ‘The Crown,’ from which we have quoted above, is classed by scholars amongst his Montanistic writings. So by searching this matter to the bottom, we find that trine immersion, like the rite of sprinkling, arose amongst the heretics.”

Let us now go back beyond Tertullian and the heretical practise of trine immersion introduced in his day, and what have we? Mosheim in his “Ecclesiastical History,” speaking of the first century, says, “The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by *an* immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.” Ah, here is the century in which Jesus was baptized, the century in which he gave the commission, the century in which the apostles baptized believers—yes, the century of pure primitive Christianity. And what have we—trine immersion? No. Baptism was performed by *an* immersion—just one immersion. But when we get into the third century, we find that heretics have arisen, and that among the things they have introduced is the practise of trine immersion.

Thank God, the time has come when the church of God is returning to the simplicity of apostolic worship and is discarding all the doctrines and commandments of men. We practise the same mode as did the primitive church in the first century of Christianity, when baptism was performed by “AN *immersion* of the whole body” under water.

INFANT BAPTISM.

This rite is worthy of careful consideration. It is practised by millions of religionists to-day, and these claim to find in Scripture sufficient authority for its practise. It is not enough simply to say that the Bible nowhere teaches it, but we must prove this by facts and truth that will convince. False theories imbibed in early youth and handed down by tradition from parent to child are not easily cast away. It takes argument to convince men; and that argument to be effective must be based on *fact* and *truth*. Fact and truth are what we must have. Human traditions, creeds, doctrines, beliefs, theories, etc. when weighed in the balance with truth will be found wanting. Dear reader, at the cost of all, even the early teaching received at mother’s knee, decide to accept the truth. Like Paul of old, it will pay to suffer the loss of all these to win Christ and his glorious truth.

First, I shall present a number of reasons why infant baptism is not Scriptural, why it is objectionable in the light of the Bible; and secondly, I shall care-

fully consider the arguments used in its favor and shall show that they have no divine authority.

1. *For infant baptism there is no authority either by command or by example.* From the first of Matthew to the last of Revelation there is not a single text in which an infant is commanded to be baptized. There is not even the faintest allusion to infants in any command relative to this ordinance. More than this, there is not a single verse in which one is said to have been baptized. Look over the record carefully.

Where is the positive command to baptize babies? The command is to baptize disciples and believers—those who are capable of exercising a personal, individual faith in God; those who have received the remission of sins. There is no commandment about infant children. This being true, there is no authority by precept for this rite. There was a positive command under the law to circumcise male children, and the Jews were under obligation to do this. Can the advocates of infant sprinkling show as much for their practise in the New Testament? They positively can not.

Then where are the examples of this practise? Among the thousands who came to John and were baptized of him in Jordan, not a single infant is mentioned. The indispensable prerequisites to his baptism were repentance and faith. Then in the history of the ministry of Jesus, covering three and one-half years, there is no record that he or his disciples ever baptized

an infant babe. He made disciples before he baptized them. John 4:1. Of the three thousand baptized on Pentecost, there was not one infant. They had all repented, received the word, and been saved. See Acts 2:38, 40, 41-47. When Philip went to Samaria and preached Christ, a multitude believed and were converted. There was great joy in the city. Whom did he baptize? "Both men and women"—those who were capable of believing Philip's preaching. See Acts 8:12. Not a word is said about the babes of these believing parents. Then, in the eighteenth chapter of Acts we read that when Paul and his company went to Corinth and preached the gospel, "many of the Corinthians *hearing believed*, and were baptized." Verse 8. In not a single case is there even an intimation that a child was baptized, nor was any one ever reproved for neglecting to have it done.

Thus, by both precept and example infants are excluded from baptism. There is not the slightest warrant for the practise. All ordinances of God are established either by positive and clear commands or by positive and clear examples. But the rite of infant baptism is lacking in both of these. Therefore we rightly conclude that it is not an ordinance of God. How can there be a positive obligation to perform a Christian duty when in the Bible not one word is said about it?

2. *The prerequisites to baptism are repentance and faith.* An infant babe is not capable of either. The Bible language is very plain. "He that believeth

and is baptized." Mark 16:16. "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Acts 8:37. "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Acts 8:12. "And many of the Corinthians *hearing believed*, and were baptized." Acts 18:8. "Repent and be baptized." Acts 2:38. "Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, . . . Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance." Luke 3:7, 8.

The Bible speaks of the baptism of none except those who had first believed. Can little infants who do not know their right hand from their left exercise faith in Jesus Christ? How can such bring forth fruits of repentance? Of what would innocent babes who have never committed a wilful sin against God repent? Men and women who were capable of hearing and believing the gospel were baptized; but in regard to the children of these believers the Bible is as silent as the grave.

It is objected, however, that if infants do not believe, then they are all damned; for the commission says, "He that believeth not shall be damned." So they teach that infants have a passive faith. Mark 9:42 is quoted to prove this—"These little ones that believe in me." This latter text has no reference to infant babes, but to adult believers in Christ. In Matt. 10:40-42. Jesus calls his twelve disciples and all true prophets and righteous men "little ones."

John in his Epistle addressed young converts whose sins had been forgiven as "little children." 1 John 2:12, 28. These little ones who believed were converted men and women, against whom ungodly men could commit offense.

As to the commission recorded by Mark 16:15, 16, the gospel must first be preached and then believed before baptism. Preach the gospel. He who hears the gospel and then accepts it, believes it, obeys it, shall be saved; but he who hears the gospel, then rejects it, disbelieves it, disobeys it, shall be damned. This is the true exegesis of the commission, the true reading when the ellipses are supplied. The case of infants is not touched in the commission. They are not capable of intelligently hearing and understanding the gospel, and they can not intelligently accept or reject that which they can not hear with understanding hearts.

3. *Infant baptism confers no benefit.* Those who have had this popish rite administered are no better morally than those who have not. Notice the children of Christian parents who do not believe and practise this observance, yet teach their children the way of truth and train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. They are just as moral and upright as the children of those parents who imposed upon their offspring this rite, which binds them to an iron-bound creed. Thousands of these speechless babes that have been sprinkled by the so-called reverend ministers become just as sinful

and ungodly as any other children. Some of the worst infidels in the world were sprinkled in infancy.

I am safe in saying that nearly half of the sprinkled children are never confirmed, never even make a profession of Christianity. The Lutheran sect alone sprinkles over thirty millions in thirty years. Rome baptizes, as she calls it, over one hundred million babes in about thirty years. All these are thus made members of these sectarian communities. What an immense load of carnality, sensuality, and wickedness of all kinds these sects must carry simply because of this rite of infant initiation!

It is argued by some that as children are sinful by nature, they need baptism to fit them for heaven; but the fact is, neither sprinkling nor immersion removes depravity from the soul. Those who have been baptized in infancy are just as depraved and manifest their sinful nature just as much as do those who have not been baptized. Infant baptism in no way affects man's sinful nature. It does not remove it, neither does it bestow any power or grace to restrain it.

All babes are "*children of wrath by nature.*" Eph. 2:3. They are born in sin as a result of the fall. Psa. 51:5; Rom. 5:12. But because they have no knowledge of right and wrong, no comprehension of the difference between good and evil, sin and righteousness, they are not accountable and hence are in a state of innocence before God. "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Jesus tasted death

for every man. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." His blood of atonement covers their case. They are passive in that blood. All children that die before coming to years of accountability are saved through the merits of that blood. It is the blood that cleanses from all sin. 1 John 1:7. Thus all infants whether baptized or not will be saved. To deny this is to teach infant damnation, which is one of the most nefarious doctrines ever invented by men or devils. Infant baptism confers no benefit.

4. *Infant baptism destroys the will and choice of the child in the things that pertain to its salvation.* It is true that a great responsibility rests upon parents in teaching and training their children. All Christian parents feel that burden. Those parents who carry their babes to the minister and have him sprinkle a few drops of water in their faces or upon their heads do not feel this responsibility a whit more keenly than do true Christian parents who without this heathen rite (for such it is) consecrate their children to God.

Concerning salvation, the redemption of the human soul, every individual becomes personally responsible. That doctrine which teaches that in the sacrament of baptism the parent gives his child to God, at which time it is born again, its name is written in heaven, and it is thus made a member of the church (sect), and needs no change of heart when it arrives at the years of the knowledge of good and evil, is

contrary to Scripture, contrary to every principle laid down in the gospel of Christ. Yet this is the doctrine of millions of people who label themselves Christian. I was brought up and catechised in this very belief.

Salvation is a matter of individual choice. 'Moses, *when he was come to years*, chose to suffer afflictions with the people of God, rather than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.' See Heb. 11:24-26. 'Choose ye whom ye will serve.' Every man must choose for himself. It is impossible to bring up children from babyhood to be Christians. The time comes in life when all come short of the glory of God, when all are lost and in need of a Savior. Through the preaching of the gospel it has pleased God to save those who believe. Every man must use his own will in this. "Whosoever will." So man stands individually responsible to God for his eternal destiny. In the judgment day our fathers and mothers will not give account for us but "every one of us shall give an account of himself to God."

Salvation, then, does not rest upon the will of our parents, but upon our own will in the matter. So with baptism. There are thousands of persons who, when they come to years, are told that when a few days or weeks old they were sprinkled by the minister and that this is baptism; but they are not satisfied in their hearts with it. They had no choice of their own in the matter. Deep in their hearts

they firmly believe that Scriptural baptism is immersion and that it is for adult believers.

It follows that if infants are thus made disciples by their parents, then the unfortunate babes who have unbelieving parents and those whose parents reject infant baptism, are not disciples, but are lost. If the names of children are recorded in heaven at the time this rite is administered then all others are left off. This is the doctrine of Catholics, Lutherans, and several other sects. But it involves them in this difficulty, that before the preacher sprinkled them their names were not recorded in the book of life. The Bible says that all such will be cast into the lake of fire. Rev. 20:15. So, in reality, infant baptism and infant damnation go together, and both were invented by the devil.

5. *Infant baptism is corrupting in its influence.* Think of it! This rite gives the Pope of Rome over one hundred million subjects every thirty years and binds them for all time to the papal throne, without one single thought, choice, or act of their own. This ceremony has been brought from Rome into Protestantism, and by practising it they admit the world into forms of religion, calling these people Christians. They admit millions of babes by the operation of the so-called regenerating process of infant baptism. In this way they bring all that are born of the flesh, without being born of the Spirit, into a profession and form of Christianity. This very rite thus binds them for life to an iron-bound

creed. It is simply a great multitude of flesh and blood and bones, uncircumcised in heart and life, but brought into the professed family of God. Oh, the multitudes who are thus being deceived! It is appalling to behold.

“Moreover thou hast taken thy sons and thy daughters, whom thou hast borne unto me, and these hast thou sacrificed unto them to be devoured. Is this of thy whoredoms a small matter, that thou hast slain my children, and delivered them to cause them to pass through the fire for them?” Ezek. 16: 20, 21. “They sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils.” Psa. 106: 37. These texts were primarily fulfilled in the devotions of ancient Israel to the fire-god Molech; but to that wickedness there is a spiritual counterpart that, in the sight of God, is far more cruel and appalling. Molech signifies rule, or dominion, and the heathen Molech will bear only a faint comparison with the soul-destroying Molech of sect rule and dominion, through which the souls of the great mass of sect idolators are destroyed and sacrificed to the flames of everlasting perdition. Oh, what an innumerable army of innocent children are being spiritually slaughtered and sacrificed to the flames of hell for the sake of the sect Molech, which these poor helpless creatures are taught to love, rather than to love God, and whose lords they are taught to fear and obey, rather than to fear and obey God!

When but a few days old, upon them is imposed

the popish rite of sprinkling for baptism; and before their young minds are capable of discriminating between truth and error, they are forestalled with the poisonous contents of creeds which have come down from the dark ages of ignorance and superstition, and which bar their souls from God and salvation and lead to idolatry and destruction. How awfully true in a spiritual sense are these words! 'Thou hast taken thy sons and thy daughters, whom thou hast borne unto me, and these hast thou sacrificed to devils to be devoured.' When a party spirit, or devotion to "our church," is infused into innocent children's hearts, what on earth will more surely bind them with Satan's chain? The casting of infants to crocodiles by Hindu parents, the burn- of them by ancient heathens and corrupted Jews, or even the eating of them by cannibals—shocking and terrible as these are, they are small things compared with the sacrifice of innocent souls on the altar of infant baptism, which unites them to human creeds and religions that worship a form and reject God and Bible holiness.

I shall now reply to some of the main arguments in favor of this rite. The leading argument brought forth in defense of infant baptism is based on the great commission as recorded by Matthew, chap. 28, verses 19, 20—"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The

argument is this: Disciples are to be made by baptizing and teaching; this includes all nations; since infant babes constitute a large per cent of the number who compose the nations they are included in the commission; hence, the command is to baptize them, then teach them, and thus make them disciples of the Lord.

This reasoning is false and is contrary to the very language of the commission itself. There is not in it the faintest allusion to infants. About all translations render this text, "Go make disciples of all nations, baptizing them." All scholars agree that *matheteusate* in the first part of the commission means to make disciples. It is so rendered in the Revised Version and a dozen other translations. "Go make disciples of all nations," says the commission. These are to be made by preaching the gospel to "every creature." See Mark 16:15. Thus, it has "pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 1 Cor. 1:21. Then, those who are capable of hearing the gospel and of believing it are saved, and thus disciples are made from among all nations. The order of the commission is to baptize these disciples. Notice carefully. "Go make disciples of all nations, baptizing them," etc. It does not say, "Baptize all nations"; for this would include all unbelievers, infidels, murderers, idolators, as well as children. The ministers of Christ are commanded to baptize *disciples* who *believe*. Matt. 28:19. 20; Mark 17:15, 17.

.

Not one word is said about the infants of these disciples. Nor does the commission say that the disciples to be baptized were such by nature. They were to be *made* disciples. They were to be *believing* disciples. Children are saved without faith, repentance, or baptism; but adults are required to believe and to be baptized. What is done to persons in infancy without their knowledge or assent is no act of their own. Christ did not command parents to have their children baptized, putting the responsibility upon them; but he commanded every one to be baptized for himself. And mark the fact, this was to be predicated, not upon the faith of their parents, but upon their own individual faith. They were to be baptized, not before they believed, but afterwards. "He that believeth, and is baptized."

The order of the commission is identical with the practise of Christ in his personal ministry. He made disciples before he baptized them. See John 4:1. This fact alone forever excludes little speechless babes from the sacred institution of baptism, for it was not instituted for them.

Again, it is affirmed by those who advocate and practise infant baptism that the church of God was organized in the family of Abraham; that it has been in existence ever since that time; that the same church has existed under both the old and new covenants; that the only difference between the church now and back under the law is that since Christ came she enlarged her borders to include the Gentiles, yet

she remained the same church in both dispensations. Laying down this premise, they next argue that children were members of the church by positive law of God under the first covenant, made such through the initiatory rite of circumcision, and that since there is no positive law enacted in the new covenant to exclude children, they are still members of that church, now made such through the initiatory rite of baptism. They say that since Christ has given infants the privilege of membership in his church, they ought to be baptized; that if they have a right to enter, they have a right to enter by the door—baptism. This is considered the Gibraltar of proof to substantiate their practise, and to the majority of them it looks conclusive. I admit that it is very fine-spun and that to the unenlightened it may look very plausible. But the whole argument is far-fetched and has not a shadow of truth to sustain it. It is positively erroneous from the ground up. I shall state three facts which completely overthrow the above position.

1. *The old testament church and the new testament church are not identical.* The literal seed of Abraham—Israel, the Jews—constituted the members of the old covenant church; while the spiritual seed of Abraham gathered out from both Jews and Gentiles constitute the members of the new covenant church. The first was a national institution; the second, a spiritual institution including the saved of all nations. The first was founded and organized

through God's direction by Moses; the second was built and organized by Christ. Matt 16:18.

The message of the gospel reads, "I make all things new." We have a new dispensation, a new covenant, a new and living way, a new heart, a new birth, a new church. The church of God was not organized in the family of Abraham; but Abraham himself looked for that city whose builder and maker is God. He foresaw Christ's day and rejoiced beforehand in it. Jesus said, "I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt 16:18. The old covenant church was simply a temporal institution, while the new is a spiritual and eternal structure. There is no identity between them.

2. *Circumcision was not the door into the old testament church, neither is water baptism the door into the new testament church.* There was no Jewish church until four hundred years after circumcision was instituted. It is true that adult proselytes came in partially by circumcision, but the Israelites—the seed of Abraham—were not made members of the Jewish church by circumcision. Natural birth was the wide door into the old covenant church. Jews brought forth Jews. These children of the bond-woman were simply "born after the flesh." Gal. 4: 21-31. Circumcision was administered to Jewish infants, not to bring them into the church, but because they were already in it. Natural birth brought them all in.

To enter the new testament church, "ye must be born again." Jesus clearly taught the Jews that in order to enter his church, or the kingdom of heaven, they must be born from above, "born of the Spirit." How clear! Natural birth admitted fleshly Israel into the church under the law; spiritual birth admits spiritual Israel into the church of Christ under the gospel. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles." 1 Cor. 12:13. Water baptism is nowhere said to be the door. Jesus said, "I am the door: by me if any man enter in he shall be saved." John 10:9. Instead of millions of speechless babes, it is a community of intelligent saved men and women. It is composed of those who are believers, those who are born of the Spirit of God. Baptism is a new testament rite to be administered only to those who are believers and already members of his church. Nicodemus was a member in good standing in the Jewish church; but Jesus plainly told him that in order to become a member of the church and kingdom which he (Jesus) came to establish, he must be born again.

3. *Baptism does not take the place of circumcision.* Baptism is a rite of the new covenant. To the New Testament, then, we must look for a precept or example of infant baptism. Who ever saw one there? There is none—not one. So the defenders of this practise go away back to Abraham in Canaan or to Moses in the wilderness in order to find a new testament ordinance. Strange, is it not? But their

whole doctrine is composed of far-fetched, round-about inferences which in reality have no foundation in the Bible. Circumcision was a type, not of baptism, but of the circumcision of the heart in salvation. See Rom. 2:28, 29; Col. 2:11.

All females were excluded from circumcision; males only were circumcised. Baptism is for male and female—"both men and women." Acts 8:12. Circumcision was binding on the parents. They were positively commanded in the law to circumcise their children. To do this was obedience; to refuse was disobedience. Where, I ask, in the New Testament is there one command for parents to baptize their infant babes? There is no such precept. "Where no law is there is no transgression"; and where there is no precept, there can be no obedience. This being true, there is no transgression in the neglect, nor any obedience in the practise, of infant baptism. "Be baptized every one of you," says the gospel. It is obligatory upon adult believers, but not upon the parents of infant children.

Acts 2:38, 39, is considered strong proof for infant baptism. "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts 2:38, 39. There is not a shadow of proof here for infant baptism. Peter did not say,

“Be baptized every one of you, and your children.” Those whom he commanded to be baptized he first commanded to repent; and none are to be baptized but those who have repented. This positively excludes infants, for they can not repent; they have nothing to repent of. “Repent, and be baptized every one of you,” can not apply to babes lying speechless upon their mother’s knee. Who were baptized at this time as a result of Peter’s sermon? Only “they that gladly received his word were baptized.” Verse 41. “And they continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine.” Verse 42. “And fear came upon every soul.” Verse 43. “And all that believed were together.” Verse 44. “And the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved.”—*Revised Version*, Verse 47. There is not a word about infants! Any one can see at a glance that these were all adults—those capable of repentance and faith.

But what about the promise to “you and your children”? The promise here referred to was not a promise of baptism, but the promise of the Holy Ghost given by the prophet Joel. This promise was to those who had already repented; to those who can be called to repentance and faith through the gospel. “even as many as the Lord our God shall call.” Unconscious infants, then, are not the persons spoken of. By the term children he simply meant their descendants. The Jewish nation was called “children of Israel.” Speaking to grown men

and women, Peter, in the next chapter, says, "Ye are the *children* of the prophets." This promise of the Spirit, predicated upon repentance and faith, was to the Jews present, to their children or descendants in all future time, to those afar off (the Gentiles), even to as many as the Lord should *call*.

Matt. 19:13, 14, is brought forward to sustain baby-sprinkling; but the proof is sadly lacking. Not one word is said about Jesus' applying a single drop of water to these little children. They were not brought for that purpose. They were brought that he should "lay his hands on them and pray." He did not baptize them, nor did he command them to be baptized. He simply "laid his hands on them and departed thence." Verse 15.

The last argument resorted to is the fact that the New Testament records a few household baptisms, and these are supposed to have included infants.

1. *The house of Cornelius. Acts 10.* There is not the faintest allusion here to infants' being baptized. All the house of Cornelius were large enough to fear God. Verse 2. Those who were assembled in the house of Cornelius at the time Peter came were "his kinsmen and near friends." Verse 24. All who were present were old enough to hear with understanding hearts the gospel that Peter preached. Verse 33. They all received the Holy Ghost, spoke with tongues, and magnified the Lord. Verses 44-46. Peter commanded to be baptized only those who had

received the Holy Ghost. Verses 47, 48. Not a word about little babes!

2. *The house of Lydia.* Acts 16:13, 15. "She was baptized, and her household." It does not say that her household were little babes. Who knows that she was ever married? There is no proof that Lydia had a husband. Her household may have been her servants or near kinsmen. No one knows. But the fact is forever settled that they were all adults; for when Paul and Silas entered into the house of Lydia, they comforted the *brethren*. Acts 16:40. This proves that her household, whether they were her own sons and daughters, her kinsfolk, or her servants, were all believers; for otherwise they would not have been called brethren.

3. *The house of the jailor.* Acts 16:28, 34. How much foundation is there here for infant baptism? Let us examine carefully. All that were in his house were capable of hearing the word of the Lord. Verses 31, 32. All in his house believed in God and rejoiced in his love. Verses 33, 34. They all heard and believed. These facts prove beyond question that no little babes were baptized. Where, then, is the Scriptural proof for this practise? Positively, there is none.

I shall here insert the testimony of men who themselves practised infant baptism, but admitted that they had no authority for it. Their testimonies are compiled from other works on the subject.

NEANDER: "Neander's Church History," page 198,

Philadelphia edition, 1843—"It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism. . . . We can not prove that the apostles ordained infant baptism."

MARTIN LUTHER—"It can not be proved that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or by the first Christians after the apostles."

RICHARD BAXTER—"I conclude that all the examples of baptism in the Scripture do mention only the administration of it to the professors of saving faith: and the precepts give no other direction."

DR. WALL—"Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infants."

ERASMUS—"The apostle does not seem to treat of infants. It was not the custom for infants to be baptized."

BISHOP BURNET—"There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants."

OLSHAUSEN, famous commentator—"There is altogether wanting any conclusive proof passage for the baptism of children in the age of the apostles."

LIMBORCH, a distinguished professor of theology and author of "System of Divinity," says: "There is no express command for it in the Scriptures. Nay, all those passages wherein baptism is commanded do immediately relate to adult persons, since they are ordered to be instructed, and faith is a prerequisite as a necessary qualification." "The necessity for infant baptism was never asserted by any council

before that of Carthage, held A. D. 418. We own that there is no precept nor undoubted instance in Scripture of infant baptism."

DR. LEONARD WOODS—"The New Testament is silent respecting the subject of infant baptism."

PROFESSOR MOSES STUART—"Commands or plain and certain examples relative to it in the New Testament, I do not find."

DR. MILLER—"The fact is, that during the whole threescore years after the ascension of Christ, which is embraced in the New Testament history, we have no hint of the baptism of infants born of Christian parents."

DR. KNAPP—"There is no decisive example of infant baptism in the Scriptures."

JOHN CALVIN—"It is nowhere expressed by the evangelists that any one infant was baptized."

DR. TAYLOR—"Christ never gave any precept to baptize them, nor ever himself or his apostles did baptize any of them."

"KITTO'S Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature," Vol. 2, p. 287—"Infant baptism was established neither by Christ nor his apostles. In all places where we find the necessity of baptism notified, either in a dogmatic or historical point of view, it is evident that it was only meant for those who were capable of comprehending the word preached, and of being converted to Christ by an act of their own will."

This line of testimony could be much drawn out, but I deem the foregoing sufficient. These frank

concessions from the leading men who have themselves practised the rite of infant baptism ought to convince any candid mind that it has no foundation in the New Testament Scriptures. There is not a book on earth written within a period of two hundred years after the birth of Christ that mentions such a thing as infant baptism. The practise was invented during the great apostasy of the church, when man-made doctrines and creeds supplanted the clear teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

PROPER CANDIDATES FOR BAPTISM.

In the previous chapter we have clearly proved that infants are not Scriptural candidates for baptism. Baptism is for adults. "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, *both men and women.*" Acts 8:12. The conditions upon which men and women may be baptized are clearly stated. "They believed Philip preaching." These were capable of hearing the gospel. Since they intelligently heard it, they could accept or reject it, could believe or disbelieve it. Those who believed were baptized. This is the order throughout the New Testament. There is not a single exception to this rule. "And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." Acts 18:8. The Ethiopian eunuch inquired, "What doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said,

If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.” Acts 8:36, 37. “Then they that gladly received his word were baptized.” “And all that believed were together.” Acts 2:41, 44.

Adult believers are proper candidates for baptism. All others are excluded. In order to become believers, people must first repent. See Matt. 21:32. “Repent ye, and believe the gospel.” Mark 1:15. Of those who came to John to be baptized of him he demanded, “Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance.” Luke 2:7, 8. On Pentecost, “Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you.” Acts 2:38. Men and women who have repented and have believed with all their hearts are the proper, Scriptural candidates for baptism.

THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

Every ordinance of God is instituted for a purpose. In order to reap the benefits designed in these sacred institutions, we must understand that purpose. It is not sufficient merely to go through the form of obedience, but it is right that we know why we do it. What, then, is the design of Christian baptism? Why was it instituted? What does it teach us? What benefit do we derive from it? All this is very clearly answered in the New Testament.

“Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.” Acts 2:38. “And now why tarriest thou? arise,

and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.” Acts 22:16. In their simplest form, these texts without question teach that baptism in some sense washes away sins. It is for us to ascertain whether this is true in a real or in a ceremonial sense. Some sects, as the Disciples, Dunkards, Mormons, and Lutherans, teach that in water baptism past sins are actually pardoned and washed away, and that until baptized people are not in the kingdom, not really saved. I affirm that the above texts teach no such thing, and I shall here give a number of Scriptural, logical reasons.

1. *Baptism is a ceremony, an external rite.* The removal of sins is an internal work, a purification of the soul, the heart. 1 Pet. 1:22, 23.

2. *The Scriptures clearly teach that the blood of Christ is the only element that can wash away sins.* “Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.” Rev. 1:5. “Justified by his blood.” Rom. 5:9. “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.” Eph. 1:7. “Redeemed us by thy blood.” Rev. 5:9. Of the teeming millions around the throne above who were clad in white robes, it was said, “These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” Rev. 7:14. Not a word about baptism.

3. *To teach that baptism must precede actual pardon or remission of sins contradicts the plain teach-*

ing of the New Testament throughout. Jesus himself says, "He that believeth on him [Son of God] is not condemned." John 3:18. That is, all believers are pardoned. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." When the Philippian jailor asked the apostles, "What must I do to be saved?" they did not mention baptism as a condition; but they said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts 16:31. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Rom. 10:9. "Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." "All that believe are justified." Acts 13:39. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." John 7:47. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." 1 John 5:1. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." 1 John 5:10. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." John 1:12. "And that believing ye might have life through his name." John 20:31.

The New Testament positively teaches that repentance and faith must precede baptism. Only those who believe with all their heart are eligible to this ordinance. Acts 18:8; 8:36, 37. Mark you, people must believe before baptism; and the above texts clearly teach that those who believe are free from condemnation, are born of God, are justified, are

saved, have everlasting life, receive remission of sins, have the witness of the Spirit, and are sons of God.

Baptism, then, is for those who are already saved. There is no way to evade this fact, sustained by such a solid foundation of Scriptural testimony. And this fact contradicts the theory that people are not saved until baptized. That doctrine contradicts Christ and his apostles, who throughout the New Testament teach that real believers are saved and that only such are qualified for Christian baptism. One text forever settles this point—“*He that believeth on him is not condemned.*”

4. *Our salvation is not dependent upon an ordinance administered by another.* There is one mediator between God and man—Christ Jesus the Lord. Through him guilty sinners may approach the Father and upon the conditions of repentance and faith receive pardon and be fully reconciled to God. This is the doctrine of the New Testament. Now, to teach that baptism inducts a person into the kingdom and that until he is baptized his sins are unpardoned is to virtually say that believers who have not been baptized are lost. A believer can not baptize himself and people are often placed in circumstances in which they can not be baptized by others. Are such ones still under the guilt of sin? Suppose a sinner repents with a broken and contrite heart, forever turns away from sin and believes on Christ with all his heart, but is a thousand miles away from any one authorized to immerse him. Would he still be

under the condemnation of his sins? Is his salvation dependent on an external rite that is not in his power to perform? Incredible.

Such a doctrine predicates salvation upon an external rite administered by man. It would send to hell many who, though willing to observe all things commanded have not the opportunity to be baptized. Suppose I repent and believe the gospel to-day, but have not the opportunity to be baptized until to-morrow. Suppose I die before I can reach a minister authorized to administer baptism. Am I exposed to eternal ruin and damnation, even though I have repented and believed the gospel? Such teaching is inconsistent. It contradicts the entire New Testament.

Some, however, admit that such persons would be saved without baptism. But to admit this is to admit that remission of sins may be obtained through repentance and faith without water baptism, for no one can be saved without remission of sins. In the name of Christ I affirm that God did not make my salvation dependent upon an act which I can not perform for myself. There is not in the New Testament one single sentence which even intimates that a true believer is condemned and doomed to hell because he can not receive an external ordinance. Every one who truly believes on Christ is immediately pardoned and has eternal life.

5. *Baptism is not prerequisite to salvation.* Baptism is not mentioned in the teachings of Christ

and his apostles as a prerequisite to present salvation from sin. Christ said, "Repent and believe the gospel." "Whosoever believeth in him [Christ] should not perish but have everlasting life." "He that believeth in him is not condemned." Faith brings salvation. Here is a point worthy of note: If in Acts 2:38 Peter taught that actual remission of sins was conditioned upon baptism, then he certainly repeated this teaching everywhere he went. If I to-day preach to a company of inquiring penitents in the city of Philadelphia in answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" am I not bound to tell them all that is necessary for them to do in order to be saved? Then, suppose that on to-morrow in the city of Pittsburg I preach to another assembly in answer to the same inquiry. Am I not bound to tell them the same truths? Certainly. I could not be a true minister and do otherwise. Where, I ask, did Peter ever after Pentecost tell inquiring souls that they must be baptized before they could be forgiven. He did not mention baptism as a condition of salvation either in his sermon as recorded in Acts 3:19 or later at the house of Cornelius. Acts 10:34-43. In the first, he said, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." In the last, he instructed them thus: "Whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." Who will doubt that Peter told them all that was necessary to know in order to obtain salvation? Yet he did not mention baptism.

An argument built on the exact wording of Acts 2:38 to prove that baptism is absolutely essential to remission of sins is not very decisive. "Repent and be baptized . . . for [eis—unto] the remission of sins." Compare this with Matt. 3:11—"I indeed baptize you with water unto [eis] repentance." In both texts we have the same original word. The language, or mode of expression, in both texts is precisely the same. But who believes that John baptized the people *in order to* repentance, or that they might repent. If we take Matt. 3:11 apart from the rest of the New Testament teaching, it certainly furnishes as strong proof for baptism in order to repentance as Acts 2:38 furnishes proof for baptism in order to the remission of sins; but other scriptures clearly prove that John required repentance before baptism: therefore it would be unsafe to build a theory on the peculiar structure of a single text, though its wording seems to convey the contrary idea. The same is true of Acts 2:38. All the New Testament teaching concurs in the truth that repentance and faith are the conditions of salvation and that all who believe enjoy the remission of past sins. Baptism is for true believers, and true believers are saved. The truth is, John baptized on profession of repentance, and Peter baptized on profession of faith in the remission of sins through the Lord Jesus Christ.

6. *The household of Cornelius were baptized after they had received remission of sins and had been sanctified by the Holy Ghost.* Acts 10. Cornelius was

“a devout man and one that feared God with all his house.” He “prayed to God always.” Verse 2. His prayers were heard. Verse 4, 31. He was a “just man.” He was accepted of the Lord. Verse 34, 35. This was all before baptism. Then when Peter came, he encouraged Cornelius by saying, “Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” This he most certainly had received by faith. But he was seeking the fulness. He was not fully saved. Acts 11:14. Though justified, he needed the sanctifying grace to complete the perfect salvation provided in Christ’s atonement. And while Peter was speaking, “the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.” “Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.” Verse 44-48. This proves clearly that water baptism is not a prerequisite to the actual remission of past sin. Cornelius received the Holy Ghost before baptism.

Baptism, then, can be only a ceremonial washing. It is an external sign of an inward grace. Take, for example, the conversion and baptism of the apostle Paul. Paul was present at the stoning of Stephen; saw his face, which shone as that of an angel; and heard his dying testimony. I am confident that the burning words and the triumphant death of this great martyr made a lasting impression upon the mind and the heart of Saul of Tarsus. As he journeyed toward

Damascus, no doubt these recent events were passing through his mind; and the more he meditated upon them, the more conviction pierced his heart. Suddenly, a light from heaven shone round about him. He fell to the ground, and when the Lord revealed himself to him, he immediately surrendered, saying, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Acts 9:3-6. Right there the Lord gave him his commission to preach the gospel. See Acts 26:13-18. Would God give such a solemn charge to an unconverted man? Never.

Three days later Ananias entered into the house where Paul was praying, "and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales." Acts 9:17, 18. Notice that Ananias addresses him as "Brother Saul." He was a converted man. Then when Ananias laid his hands upon him, he received the Holy Ghost, was sanctified. Now after all this he said to him, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Acts 22:16. His sins had already been really washed away in the blood of Jesus. He had received the Holy Ghost. So the language of Ananias proves that baptism is but a ceremonial washing away of sins. It is a public testimony and figure of what has already taken place in our inner being. First we plunge into that fountain opened to the house of David for sin and uncleanness—the

blood—and are washed from the guilt of sin. Then to publicly testify to this fact, we are plunged into the water of baptism and thus emblematically, or in rite, wash our sins away.

Peter expresses this same thought in his Epistle. He says, “In the days of Noah . . . eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” 1 Pet. 3:20, 21.

The salvation of Noah and his family is to us a beautiful figure of our salvation from sin. But let us examine. Before the water came Noah entered the ark. All that were without the ark at the time when the great deluge came were lost. So with salvation. The ark was a type of Christ, our ark of safety; and just as Noah and his family entered the ark before the great waters came, so we first enter Christ by faith, and after being secure in his salvation—our ark of safety—we go into the water for baptism. The salvation of Noah, then, was a beautiful figure of our salvation in Christ. Peter says that baptism is a “like figure.” Salvation comprehends a glorious resurrection from a dead state in sins to life in Christ. Baptism is a figure of this. When raised out of the water, we testify in figure that we have risen to walk in newness of life. Baptism, then, is salvation only in a figure. It is “not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,” or in other words, the

washing away of actual sins, which are the works and the lusts of the flesh (see Gal. 5:19); but in figure we in baptism testify and show that these have already been washed away in the blood of Christ. Baptism is but the outward sign of the inward work, "the answer of a good conscience."

Those who trust in baptism for their salvation have only the ceremony, figure, and outward rite. That is why Campbellites, Mormons, Dunkards, and other water-salvationists are so dead spiritually. They have the external form, but not the inward grace. Thank God, we have first the inward grace and then the external rite also.

Everything in the economy of divine grace had its type in the old testament. In the fourteenth chapter of Leviticus is a beautiful type of real salvation through the blood and of figurative salvation in baptism. "This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing: He shall be brought unto the priest: and the priest shall go forth out of the camp; and the priest shall look, and, behold, if the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper; then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: and the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water: as for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water: and he shall

sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field. And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and wash himself in water that he may be clean: and after that he shall come into the camp, and shall tarry abroad out of his tent seven days." Lev. 14:2-8.

Leprosy is a type of sin; the leper, a type of the sinner; the priest, a type of Christ. As the leper came to the priest for cleansing, so the sinner now comes to Christ. First, the priest sprinkled blood upon the leper and pronounced him clean. After this, the leper washed himself in water that he might be clean. But mark the fact that before he dipped himself in water, the priest had sprinkled blood upon him and had declared him clean. Both the blood and the water were for cleansing, but the blood preceded the water. What a beautiful type of New Testament salvation! We come to Christ with a broken and contrite spirit, and when the last condition has been complied with in repentance, the blood is sprinkled and all our sins are washed away. As the priest pronounced the leper clean, so the Spirit witnesses to our hearts that all our sins are gone and that we are clean. As after the blood had been applied and the leper had been pronounced clean, he washed in water for cleansing; so after the blood has cleansed away all our sins and the Spirit has witnessed to the fact, we are baptized in water and

“wash away our sins.” This last is but the outward ceremonial washing—a figure and symbol of the real work that has already been wrought.

Baptism, then, is salvation in a figure. In it we testify to the fact of our sins’ being remitted by the blood of Christ. Those who go down into the water without first being saved, testify to a lie and dishonor the sacred rite of Christian baptism.

“Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” Rom. 6:3, 4. Here we have the real work and the outward figure again beautifully connected. First we are baptized into Christ. How? “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” 1 Cor. 12:13. The baptism which places us into the one body, the church (which is the same as being baptized into Christ), is the work of the Spirit. The baptism “into Christ” is not the literal rite of water, but that which is administered to the soul by the Spirit in regeneration. “Therefore we are buried with him by baptism.” That is, having by the Spirit in regeneration been baptized or inducted, into Christ, we are now buried in baptism. The Spirit baptizes us into Christ in

reality, while in water baptism we are formally baptized into him, into his name.

Baptism is a figurative burial and resurrection with Christ and a pledge to walk in newness of life. In it we testify in figure that while once we were dead in sins, we have risen to life in Christ, and that we are dead to the world and to sin and alive unto God forevermore. We also testify in figure the death, burial, and glorious resurrection of Christ our Lord. Our eternal salvation was purchased through his death and resurrection, and how fitting that those who are saved should in this ordinance testify to the fact by being buried in the liquid tomb of waters and then raised out again! It is also true that in baptism we make public attestation to the fact of our future resurrection in glorified bodies in final resurrection. The resurrection of the dead is the foundation of our hopes in the future, eternal rewards of the righteous. In this beautiful ordinance we show our unwavering faith in this blessed truth. 1 Cor. 15:29.

Baptism is one of the commands necessary to obey in order that we may enjoy eternal salvation. Our future, eternal salvation is predicated upon faith in, and obedience to, the whole gospel of Christ. This includes baptism as well as other rites and commands of the Savior. Mark 16:15, 16; Matt. 28:20. To wilfully disregard and set it aside is to be finally damned.

BORN OF WATER AND OF THE SPIRIT.

While conversing with Nicodemus the Savior uttered these words: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter the kingdom of God." John 3:5. This conversation was held with "a ruler of the Jews," a man conversant with the washings, or ablutions, of the old covenant. Hence it was natural that Jesus, in explaining the birth of the Spirit, would connect the emblem and the thing signified. Water is an emblem of cleansing. The new birth is elsewhere referred to as a "*washing of regeneration.*" Titus 3:5. It has been held by some religionists who are only "born of the flesh" that Jesus here referred to the literal rite of water baptism; but such is not true for the following reasons:

Not in a single text do any of the inspired writers call baptism a birth. That Christ had no reference to baptism as essential to the new birth, is clear from the fact that water is mentioned but once and then entirely dropped. It is simply used as an illustration of the nature of the new birth this once, and then Jesus proceeds to expound the new birth itself. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Verse 6. He contrasts the natural fleshly birth with the birth of the Spirit. The natural birth "is flesh," but that part of us which passes through the new birth "is spirit." It is the soul, or inner man, that is washed in regeneration. Any sensible man knows that literal water can not cleanse the soul. The new birth is a

moral change, a change of heart and life. It is effected by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

It is as invisible as the wind. "The kingdom of God," said Jesus, "cometh not with observation," not in visible operation. The spiritual birth inducts us into this spiritual kingdom. Verse 5. This work is as invisible as the wind that blows. Verse 8. "So is every one that is born of the Spirit." The wind is one of the most powerful agents in nature, and its effects may be seen everywhere; yet the wind itself and its operation is invisible to the natural eye. So with spiritual birth. The Spirit itself and its operation upon the soul of man are invisible, but the effects can be seen by all in the change of the nature and the life of the individual. Baptism is a visible operation, a visible performance; hence it can not be the new birth that Jesus referred to—that birth which inducts us into the spiritual kingdom of God.

In the many places throughout the New Testament where the new birth is mentioned, not once do the inspired writers include in it water baptism. This fact proves that they did not understand Jesus to teach so in this discourse.

Jesus taught that the spiritual birth inducts men and women into the kingdom of God. Paul plainly says that this is a work of God himself. See Col. 1: 12, 13. Water baptism is administered by man; hence it can not be that birth.

The church of God and the kingdom of God are identical. When in the kingdom, we are in the

church. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." 1 Cor. 12:13. This again proves that the birth which inducts us into the one body—church, or family of God—is not water baptism, but the work of the Spirit.

"As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were born . . . of God." John 1:12, 13. We become sons of God by being born of God. This is the experience of all "that believe on his name." There is not a word about baptism. How is an individual to know that he is a child of God? By the fact that he has been baptized? No; "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God." Rom. 8:16. You see that an external rite is not our evidence of sonship.

In the Scriptures the term water is very frequently used in an emblematical sense. In Isa. 41:17, 18; 55:1; 12:3, the term water means salvation. Hence we read of "rivers of pleasures" (Psa 36:8); "streams of gladness" (Psa. 46:4); "river of peace" and "flowing streams" of glory (Isa. 66:12); and "water of life." Rev. 22:17; 21:6. In conversing with the woman at Jacob's well, Jesus said, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up unto everlasting life." John 4:14. Did Jesus mean literal water in this saying? No one so believes. He

was speaking of the joys and the glories of his great salvation, and he used water as an emblem of the same. As cool water quenches natural thirst; so the joy, peace, love, and glory of salvation fully quenches the thirst of the longing soul. Again, in John 7:37, 38, water is used as an emblem of the Holy Spirit. Verse 39.

If time and space would permit, I could show a score of other things, such as trouble, afflictions, nations, and peoples, that the term water is used to represent. What could better represent nations than the mighty sea? overwhelming sorrows and afflictions than floods of water? the refreshing, abundant, fertilizing qualities of the Holy Spirit than rivers of living waters? the satisfying quenching, life-giving, free joys and pleasures of salvation than waters of life? and the cleansing, purifying effects of the glorious gospel truth than clear water? Thus it is used in the Scriptures, as in John 3:5. In conversing with this Jew, Jesus used the term water in connection with the spiritual birth, which inducts all seeking souls into the kingdom, or church, of God. He did this to convey to Nicodemus's mind the thought of a moral cleansing.

The Jewish tabernacle was a beautiful type of the church, or kingdom, that Jesus came to set up. At the entrance to that literal sanctuary stood the laver, a large reservoir of water, which was borne upon the backs of the similitude of twelve oxen. A washing in the waters of that laver was necessary in order

to enter the house of God. These oxen upon whose backs rested the laver, or sea, had their heads pointed in every direction—three toward the north, three toward the south, three toward the east, and three toward the west. Of what was the water of that laver a type? Was it a type of water baptism? No; water is not a type of water. The oxen were a clear type of God's new testament ministry; the water upon their backs, a type of a cleansing element that the ministry were to bear to the people. Their heads' pointing in every direction was a type of the fact that God's ministers were to carry this saving element to all nations. What is that element? There is but one answer—the gospel.

Speaking to those who had washed in the new testament laver, Jesus said, “Now ye are *clean through the word* which I have spoken unto you.” John 15:3. This makes it clear that the bath of regeneration (Titus 3:5) is “the washing of water *by the word.*” Eph. 5:26. Ezekiel, the prophet, spoke of clean water's cleansing the people from all their filthiness and idols. Ezek. 36:25, 26. The same was to give them a new heart and a new spirit. Clean water here is an emblem of a clean gospel, which truly produces all the above effects.

But is the cleansing Word anywhere connected with the new birth? Yes. “Being born again . . . by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” 1 Pet. 1:23. “Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind

of first-fruits of his creatures.” Jas. 1:18. “For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.” 1 Cor. 4:15. “The engrafted word, which is able to save your souls.” Jas. 1:21. In the cleansing waters of this saving truth every sinner must wash, at which time the blood is applied and the Holy Spirit quickens the soul into a new life and a new kingdom, even the kingdom of heaven. This is being “born of water [the cleansing, saving gospel] and of the Spirit,” elsewhere termed “the washing of regeneration.”

IMPORTANCE OF BAPTISM.

Baptism is regarded by many as a mere secondary matter, as of no vital importance, and as optional with the people respecting its observance. Some converts neglect it for months and even years. Sometimes revival services are held in which numbers are converted, but in which the subject of baptism is not even mentioned. These things ought not so to be. In this chapter I desire to impress upon the reader the real importance of this sacred rite.

Jesus, our blessed Master and Redeemer, set us the example by being baptized of John in the waters of Jordan. All heaven approved of the act. He thus fulfilled all righteousness. It behooves us, then, to follow his steps. But not only was Christ baptized of John, but he made and baptized more disciples than

John did. See John 4:1, 2. The people flocked to his baptism. John 3:22, 26.

If this rite was of no consequence, why did Jesus institute it and through his apostles administer it to all the disciples he made through preaching the gospel? He considered it of such moment that in the last great commission to his ministers, which is binding to the end of the world, he commands them to baptize all the disciples that they make from among all nations. He commands them to baptize and enjoins it upon them to teach the people “to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you.”

“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Mark 16:16. The Bible teaches both a present and a future salvation—a present salvation from all sin, predicated upon repentance and faith; and a future salvation from wrath and eternal judgment unto eternal rewards in heaven in immortal and glorified bodies, this salvation being predicated upon faith and obedience to the whole truth, the observance of “all things” commanded, which includes baptism. Hence the solemn declaration, “He that *believeth and is baptized* shall be saved.” There can be but one conclusion; namely, that all who wilfully refuse to be baptized will be damned. “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.” Jas. 2:10. “He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.” 1 John 2:4.

All ordinance-opposers and wilful neglecters will,

in the day of judgment, be cast off on the left hand, guilty of breaking the law of God, and "will have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." Only those who obey the whole gospel will finally be saved. "He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Heb. 5:9.

The first apostles and the true primitive ministry recognized the importance of baptism as enjoined in the commission. They did not leave its observance optional with the people. On the day of Pentecost Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, thus commanded the multitude: "Repent and be baptized every one of you." Acts 2:38. Not one was excepted. All that repented were commanded to be baptized. The apostle laid such emphasis upon the observance of this institution that all "they that gladly received the word were baptized." Verse 41. And from the reading, it appears that this was not delayed for days, months, or years after their conversion. No, it took place "the same day." If it was regarded of such importance on the day when the church of God was organized, in her pure infancy, before the great apostasy, it is important to-day. This was called the "apostles' doctrine" (verse 42), and Paul says, "The things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14:37. The apostles taught and practised just as the Lord Jesus had commanded them, and the Holy Spirit directed.

In the eighth chapter of Acts we read that Philip

went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto the people. He had a real revival there. Many were healed of their diseases, and there was great joy in the city. Did Philip leave the place without baptizing his converts? No; "when they believed . . . they were baptized both men and women." Verse 12. The language implies that as soon as men and women became believers he baptized them. He, like Peter, regarded it of vital importance.

After this, Philip went towards Gaza. On his way he met with an Ethiopian eunuch, who was reading from the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. Philip entered his carriage and from the same scripture preached unto him Jesus. "As they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptized?" See Acts 8:26-36. How did this eunuch know anything about baptism? Philip probably preached baptism in that first sermon. When he preached Christ, he included baptism. Nor did he preach it as a mere non-essential and as a secondary thing of little importance. No. He presented it in such a manner and laid such stress upon it that the eunuch felt the need of it. He felt under the weight of Philip's preaching that he must be baptized at the first opportunity. So when they came to the water, he immediately asked, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" The language clearly implies that Philip had just been teaching him the great importance of water baptism. When the eunuch enquired about

it, Philip did not put him off, advising him to wait until some later date; but immediately after the eunuch had confessed his belief in Christ, Philip took him down into the water and baptized him. This was the apostolic order throughout.

Next is recorded the conversion of Saul. Acts 9. Ananias came to Saul and laid his hands upon him; and as soon as Saul had received his sight, Ananias commanded him to "arise and be baptized," and he immediately "arose and was baptized." His baptism was not deferred until some future date, but he was baptized at the first opportunity. It certainly seems that baptism in the primitive church was regarded as a very significant ordinance.

After Cornelius and his household had received the Holy Ghost, Peter "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts 10:44-48. Mark the fact. It was not simply a matter of choice with them, but the apostle *commanded* it. It was of great importance. To be apostlic, then, we must attach the same importance to this institution and must preach to the people that they are positively commanded to be baptized and that to disobey means condemnation.

In the sixteenth of Acts we find recorded the baptism of Lydia and also the baptism of the Philippian jailor. As soon as Lydia's heart had been opened to see and believe the truth, she was baptized. This was the first gospel sermon that she had ever heard; but in that first sermon Paul and Silas preached

water baptism. They had a good opportunity to do so, as they were by a riverside. These apostles regarded baptism of great importance and therefore presented the truth on it in such a decisive manner that Lydia and her household received baptism before returning home. Verses 13-15. The jailor and his house believed and were converted some time after midnight. It was the first gospel sermon that he had ever heard; but in that first sermon the apostles preached baptism. The result was that the jailor was baptized that very night. See verses 25-35.

With these facts and clear examples before us, how can any one say that there is no importance attached to this sacred rite. The apostles laid great stress upon it. So must we. An examination of all the baptisms administered in the New Testament convinces me that in the primitive church baptism followed close after conversion, or when the first opportunity was presented. It should not be neglected to-day. I have observed, that as a general thing, when converts are baptized shortly after believing on Christ, their baptism is witnessed to by special manifestations of God's presence and power. How often have we seen such come up out of the water with shining faces and loud shouts of victory!

Baptism is a public induction into the holy name of the Trinity; a public testimony of our great salvation from sin; a ceremonial and figurative washing away of sins; an emblematical death, burial, and resurrection, in which we attest the fact that we are

risen with Christ to walk in newness of life. There is something sacred and divine in this institution. It is a monument erected by Christ that has stood the storms of ages; and to-day, after nineteen centuries have passed, thousands are still following the b'lessed Savior by being buried with him by baptism into his death.

BAPTISM A NEW TESTAMENT INSTITUTION.

Those who oppose baptism and advocate the anti-ordination doctrine affirm that water baptism was an old testament rite. And as Jesus abolished all old covenant ordinances, nailing them to his cross, they maintain that baptism is no more binding upon Gentile Christians than is circumcision and the Jewish Sabbath. They teach that John the Baptist and Christ practised this ordinance during their personal ministry because the law was still in vogue; that the apostles continued to administer it for a number of years after it had really been abolished, they not having better light; but that about the year A. D. 60 the apostles received new light and utterly rejected baptism and all other ordinances. By classing baptism, the Lord's Supper, and feet-washing in with circumcision, the Jewish Sabbath, meats and drinks, and the divers washings of the old testament, these false teachers seem to have a strong argument; for in several texts the abolition of all old testament ordinances is clearly affirmed.

The main way of offsetting the antiordination heresy has been to prove that every New Testament text which tells of the abolition of ordinances refers to old covenant ordinances. But as far as I have observed, about all ordinance-opposers admit this. They teach that Christ never instituted any ordinances in the new testament; that all ordinances belonged to the old covenant; and that hence they are abolished. Quakerism is the mother of all these God-dishonoring doctrines.

To refute these doctrines we have but to prove that baptism, as practised by Christians, is exclusively a new testament institution. Among all the writings and the teachings of the antiordination factions, notwithstanding their strong declarations that water baptism belonged to the old testament, I have failed to find a single citation to a clear example of one immersion administered to the people by the old testament ministry. There is not one. There is nowhere in the Old Testament an account of one administration of water baptism as that administered by John, Christ, and the apostles in the New. Where in the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, or Deuteronomy, which are the five books of Moses, do we read that any Patriarch, any Jewish priest, or any one else led a candidate down into the water and baptized him in any name? There is not one single example. Where in the five books of Moses is such a thing commanded? Not a command can be found. Again, I ask, where in all the remainder

of the book of the law is there a place where baptism is taught either by precept or by examples? Clear commands can be found with reference to circumcision, the Sabbath, meats and drinks, etc.; but where is a command found to baptize any one in the name of a Savior to come, as John baptized the people? Acts 19:4. Again, we read in many places where they circumcised the people but whoever heard of one person's baptizing another, as is commanded and practised in the gospel?

The assertion that water baptism as administered by Christ and his apostles belonged to the law is as baseless as the shadow of a dream. It is a positive falsehood invented by crooked men and devils. All such teachers will be found liars in the day of judgment. I challenge any one to produce a single command or example in all the book of the law. Who can point to the chapter and verse? There were "divers washings" under the law, such as the priest bathing his flesh and washing his clothes (Heb. 9:10; Num. 19:7), and these bathings of the body and washing of clothes were performed by dipping; but to say that these were baptism as commanded and practised in the gospel dispensation is to betray great ignorance and to utter an absurdity. They bathed themselves back there; they bathed their own clothes; but the bathing of the Jews has no more to do with baptism as practised under the gospel than eating supper has to do with the sacred Lord's Supper. Baptism is administered in the name of the holy

Trinity and by the authority of Jesus Christ. It is administered by another. After speaking of the blotting out of the handwriting of Jewish ordinances, the apostle says, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days: which are a shadow of things to come." Col. 2:14-17. These were the ordinances abolished by Christ. Notice that baptism is not mentioned, nor classed in with the rites which were nailed to the cross. The reason is clear; namely, baptism did not belong to the Jewish code.

The gospel message is expressed in these words: "I make all things new." We have a new dispensation, a New Testament, a new covenant, new commandments, a new and living way, new hearts; we walk in newness of life, serve in newness of spirit, are new creatures; and we have a new church, and this new church has new ordinances to keep and observe. Among these is water baptism, which belongs exclusively to the gospel.

The first inspired proof of the existence of water baptism as an ordinance administered to penitent believers is the record of that performed by John the Baptist in the Jordan River. John's ministry and baptism was the beginning of the gospel and not the perpetuating of the Jewish code. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way

before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Mark 1:1-5. John the Baptist was the first proclaimer of the incarnate Messiah. He was the forerunner of Jesus Christ. Of John and his work Zacharias prophesied, "And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace." Luke 1:76-79. He was the first prophet of the new covenant. Utter night and darkness had enveloped the earth for about four hundred years; but John is represented as a dayspring from on high, a morning star, that foretold the speedy approach of the day—a harbinger of the rising of the "Sun of righteousness." His work and ministry were the dawn of day, the glorious gospel day.

In view of all these facts, St. Mark, with the utmost propriety, begins the gospel dispensation with the preaching and the baptism of John the Baptist. The introduction of the new testament commenced

with the baptism of John. "The law and the prophets were until John: *since that time* the kingdom of God is preached." Luke 16:16; Matt. 11:12, 13. John was the first to proclaim the glad tidings—gospel—of the kingdom of God. This proves beyond question that baptism as administered by John belonged to the kingdom of heaven—the new dispensation—and was "the beginning of the gospel."

The baptism of John was approved by the holy Trinity. Christ approved of it by receiving baptism at the prophet's hand; the Holy Spirit approved of it by descending upon Christ in visible form as a dove, when he arose out of the water; and the Father's approval was expressed in these words: "I am well pleased." Not only did Jesus set the example by being himself baptized, but he instituted the great Christian ordinance which has been observed ever since. "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized." John 3:22. "And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." Verse 26. "John answered and said, A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven. . . . He must increase, but I must decrease." Verses 27, 30. "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John." John 4:1. Christian baptism, as instituted by Christ, was administered

for a different purpose than John's baptism; but in action it was the same. The above language clearly proves that Christ instituted water baptism and administered the same. It was a part of the gospel. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

Of necessity, the new testament system, its doctrines and observances, had to be introduced before the Savior's death. This took place from the time John began crying in the wilderness, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and baptizing in Jordan, to the death of Christ on the cross. During that period the truths of the gospel were introduced. You see there was a lapping of dispensations. The law was in vogue until the Savior's death; but John's preaching and baptism ushered in the gospel dispensation. From that time on the kingdom of God was preached, and men pressed into it.

The death of Christ was the date when the old testament was abolished (Eph. 2:13-16; Col. 2:14, 15, 16, 17); and as the will of a man comes into force at his death, the new testament came into force at the death of the Savior. Heb. 9:15-17. As baptism was introduced and instituted under the new dispensation, it forms a part of the gospel, belongs to the new testament, and ever since the death of Christ has been in force and obligatory upon all believers. It was ratified and sealed with the precious blood of Christ. Since the truths of the gospel were introduced before Christ's death, the later writ-

ings of the apostles were but developments of those glorious truths delivered by Christ. This being true, we not only find baptism taught and practised in the Gospels, but find it frequently mentioned in the Acts and the Epistles. The apostles clearly understood baptism to be a new testament institution; for after the death and ascension of Christ they administered it to both Jews and Gentiles. The sacred writings abound in proof of its observance, both by precept and by example. Then, immediately following the sacred writings, we have the writings of the co-laborers and disciples of the first apostles, and they mention baptism as a sacred new testament rite. The church Fathers, and, in fact, all church historians, record the fact that water baptism was administered for centuries after the death of the apostles. We can clearly trace it back through the ages to the apostles, yes, to the great commission, and still farther to Christ in the Jordan River. Water baptism is a new testament institution.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.

We have seen that the baptism of John marked the beginning of the gospel. Mark 1:1-5. His work was the ushering in of the new dispensation, the preaching of the kingdom of God, and the baptizing of all that entered therein. It was not the perpetuating of the Jewish code nor an administration of its ordinances. "The law and the prophets were *until*

John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Luke 16:16. "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John." Matt. 11:12, 13. Language could scarcely be found to teach more clearly than the above that John's ministry and baptism belonged exclusively to the kingdom of heaven. He was not a prophet of the old covenant, not a teacher of the law, but a prophet of the new covenant—the first one of the new dispensation.

What was the burden of John's preaching? "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Mark 1:4. John's baptism was a part of the gospel of the kingdom of God. There is no appeal from the clear testimony of truth on this point. This fact was further attested by the apostles when they chose Matthias to fill the place of Judas. The requirement was that the man chosen should be one who had accompanied with them all the time, "beginning from the baptism of John," until Christ was taken up into heaven. See Acts 1:21, 22. You see, the baptism of John was recognized as a part of the new dispensation of the gospel.

Jesus asked the elders of Israel a question which they did not dare to answer. It was this: "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men? Answer me." Mark 11:30. This same question

applies to all modern antiordinance people, who class baptism in with Jewish rites. Paul plainly says that the abolished ordinances are such as are "after the commandments and doctrines of men." See Col. 2: 14, 20-22. Now, Mr. Ordinance-opposer, was the baptism of John of men? was it a mere doctrine and command of men? Answer me. If so, then it was not of divine origin; but if it was from heaven, then it was administered under a divine commission and it formed a part of the gospel arrangement. "Was it from heaven, or of men?" We are not left to guess at an answer nor to speculate concerning it. The answer is clearly given in the same New Testament where the question is propounded. Here is the answer: "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." John 1: 6. John was commissioned from heaven to perform his ministry. God sent him to discharge the very work that he carried out. This included baptism; for John himself testifies, "He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me," etc. John 1: 33. God sent John to baptize; hence baptism is from heaven, and not of men.

"The word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins." Luke 3: 2, 3. A large number came to Jordan and were baptized of him as a result of this preaching. His preaching, you see, was a new announcement. What he preached

he received, not from Moses and the law, but by direct revelation from the Lord. The word of God came to him, and he preached that word—preached baptism in all the country round about Jordan. Baptism, then, was a part of the word of God that was given to John direct from the Lord, and Mark says it was gospel. Mark 1:1-5. “But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.” Luke 7:30. To reject water baptism then was to reject the counsel of God. This is true to-day. All who oppose baptism are against God and his eternal word. In the day of judgment such will be found with those ancient Pharisees and lawyers on the left hand, and God and his word will be against them.

I wish to call the reader's attention to another fact. Water baptism is never called Moses' baptism or the baptism of the law. The reason is clear. It did not belong to that dispensation. Under John's ministry water baptism was always termed “the baptism of John” (Matt. 21:25; Mark 11:30; Luke 20:4; 7:29; Acts 1:22; 18:25); “John's Baptism” (Acts 19:3); and “his baptism.” Matt. 3:7. If it had been observed under the law for centuries before John, as false teachers assert, it would never have been called “John's baptism.” It was, you see, an observance peculiar to John and his ministry. The Sabbath or any other Jewish rite was never called John's. Why? Because they belonged to Moses and the law. But water baptism was given to John by

the Lord. He sent John to baptize, and he did what the Lord commanded. He was the first that ever administered the rite. His baptism and preaching prepared a people for the Messiah. John's baptism was something special that belonged to his ministry. It began with him and ended with him. If it had been a common ordinance of the Jews, the Pharisees and the lawyers would have received it; but these rejected baptism at the hands of John. John preached baptism to the people before they came to him to be baptized. It was not a common practise among them. Another thought—those who received the baptism of John were called "John's disciples." See Mark 2:18; Luke 5:33; 11:1; John 3:25. Those who were under the law and kept its ordinances were called "Moses' disciples" (John 9:28), while those who obeyed John's teaching and received his baptism were the disciples of John. This again proves that water baptism was not a Jewish rite, but that it began with the ministry of John.

Jesus received baptism at the hands of John and thus approved of his baptism. At first, John refused to baptize the Lord, feeling his great unworthiness to perform the act; but Christ said unto him, "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Matt. 3:15. Antiordinance people say that John and Jesus thus fulfilled the law. It does not say that they fulfilled the law, but that they fulfilled righteousness. The word fulfil means to complete, end, or finish; also, to perform. Which

does it mean here? Certainly Christ did not put an end to righteousness. His mission was to "bring in everlasting righteousness." Dan. 9:24. Righteousness was not of the law, but is of the gospel. Baptism, then, is one of the righteous acts of the gospel. Both John and Jesus performed, or fulfilled, righteousness in baptism.

But it is argued that Jesus was at this time initiated into his priestly office, just as the Levites of the law. This reasoning is false; it has no foundation in Scripture. These same preachers say that baptism is one of the carnal rites and commands of the law, which were abolished. But Christ was made a priest, "not after the law of a carnal commandment." Heb. 7:16. His priesthood was not after the Aaronic or Levitical order at all. See Heb. 7:5, 11-17, 20, 21. Jesus Christ was made a priest "after the order of Melchisedec." Heb. 5:6, 9, 10; 7:12, 20, 21. Instead of Jesus' being inducted into his priestly office by John's baptizing him in Jordan, he was made a priest by the oath of Jehovah. Heb. 7:20, 21. "Not called after the order of Aaron." This fact forever demolishes the antiordination contention.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

Baptism as administered in the church of God to-day is not "John's baptism," but is a rite instituted by Christ himself. John's ministry and baptism were a preparatory work and peculiarly belonged to him. His baptism properly began with him, and it ended with him. The design of Christian baptism is different from that of John's. "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 19:4, 5. From this it appears that John's disciples were rebaptized, or received Christian baptism after having been baptized with the baptism of John. John baptized in the name of a Savior to come, while Christian baptism is administered in the name of a Christ who has appeared—in the name of a crucified and resurrected Savior.

The term Christian baptism is very proper when it is made clear that Christ established this institution. "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized." John 3:22. "And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." Verse 26. "John answered and said, . . . He must increase, but I must decrease."

Verses 27-30. "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John." John 4:1. The reader will observe that Jesus came into the same country where John had baptized, and began making disciples and baptizing them. All men began to flock to his baptism. John's following from that time began to decrease, while that of Jesus increased. He made and baptized more than John. Water baptism, then, was instituted by the Savior himself, hence is a Christian rite.

This great ordinance which he established he commanded to be administered to disciples to the end of the world. His last great commission, which is binding upon the ministry and the church till the consummation of time, reads: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. 28: 19, 20. "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them," etc.—*Revised Version*. Some modern folks, in their zeal to oppose the sacred commands of Jesus, say that the baptism here referred to is Spirit baptism. Such a position is absurd in the extreme, for the following reasons:

1. We have abundantly proved in a former chapter that the literal primary meaning of baptize is dip or immerse. Now, in the commission there is not a hint that Jesus used the word baptize in a meta-

phorical sense. There is nothing in the context that hints at such a thing. In all such cases it must be taken in a literal sense.

2. This rite was to be administered by men. The ministry are commanded to baptize disciples; but no man can baptize another with the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. Christ alone can pour out the Holy Ghost upon the people. Ministers can pray for people and lay their hands upon them, agreeing in faith, as the apostles sometimes did, but they can not give the Holy Spirit.

3. The apostles understood the commission in a literal sense; for in fulfilling it in their ministry, they preached to the people and administered water baptism to their converts. A careful, unprejudiced study of the book of Acts will show that the apostles both preached and practised water baptism; and they did this in obedience to the commission. There is no way under heaven to evade the overwhelming testimony of the last great commission, which makes water baptism a Christian institution obligatory upon all of God's people to the end of the world.

On the day of Pentecost, Peter, who was filled with the Holy Ghost, commanded the people to be baptized. "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." Verse 38. In obedience to the solemn charge of the holy apostle "they that gladly received his word were baptized." Verse 41. This was on the very day when the church was organized—the time of pure pristine Christianity. The

apostle who commanded the people to be baptized and those who administered baptism were under the direct inspiration and leading of the Holy Ghost. Their example and teaching, then, is certainly safe to follow. If they were mistaken in what they did, how are we to know what is truth? I prefer to follow them rather than the teaching of modern Quakerism. God pity the men who have become so wise that they will set aside and utterly ignore the commands and the practises of the holy apostles in the time of pure Christianity. Of such it could well be said, "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." The advanced light they claim to have is the worst midnight darkness.

Under Philip's preaching at Samaria "they were baptized, both men and women." Acts 8:12. This was water baptism; for they received the Holy Ghost at a later date under the labors of Peter and John. Verses 14-17. Was Philip mistaken in what he did? Strange that this man, who was filled with the Holy Ghost (Acts 6:3-5), should impose upon these innocent converts an old Jewish rite abolished at the cross! Philip "preached Christ" to those Samaritans (verse 5), not the law of Moses. Baptism, then, belongs to Christ, and not to Moses.

The Gentile house of Cornelius received water baptism. The account is very clear. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with

Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.' Acts 10:44-48. You see, Peter commanded these Gentiles, who had first received the Holy Ghost, to be baptized, just the same as the Jewish converts.

"But the ordinance-opposers claim that about this time Peter received different light, by which he saw that previous to this time he had been in error on the ordinance question, and that after this date he ceased to teach and administer water baptism. This they gather from his words before the church at Jerusalem when they held him at fault for preaching unto the Gentile household of Cornelius. The following are the words they thus wrest: 'Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God.' Acts 11:16, 17. These words the antiordination people regard as Peter's confession that he had done wrong in teaching Cornelius and his household to be baptized; but nothing of the kind is hinted at.

"In the first place, let it be remembered that Peter

was not reproved by the church for his teaching Cornelius to be baptized; but as Cornelius was a Gentile, they censured Peter saying, "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." Verse 3. At that date the church in general had not learned that the Gentiles as well as the Jews were entitled to salvation. This is more clearly set forth in verse 19—'Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen traveled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only.' Thinking, as the above clearly shows, that none but Jews were to be saved, they thought Peter had committed an offense when he carried the gospel to Cornelius.

"In defense of what he had done, Peter related to them how God had showed him by the vision of the sheet knit at the four corners that Gentiles as well as Jews were entitled to salvation (verses 4-10); how God had commanded him to go and preach the gospel to Cornelius (verse 12); and how an angel had appeared to Cornelius and had commanded him to send for Peter. Verse 13. Then he told how, while he was preaching to Cornelius' household, God poured out the Holy Ghost upon them. Verse 17. After that he asks, 'What was I, that I could withstand God?' intending by these words to convey the idea, not that he had withstood God when he commanded Cornelius and his household to be baptized, but that he would have withstood God had he refused to preach the gospel to that Gentile family.

“Verse 18 shows that Peter’s defense satisfied his accusers, and is further proof that the point in question was not water baptism, but the salvation of the Gentiles. ‘When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.

“Neither do Peter’s words in verse 16, ‘Then remembered I the word of the Lord,’ etc., show, as they affirm, that Peter on that occasion found out that he had been wrong in teaching baptism; for immediately after these words came to his mind, which was at the time when the Holy Ghost fell upon Cornelius and his household (read carefully verses 15, 16), he commanded them to be baptized in water. Acts 10:44-48.

“Another point worthy of mentioning here is that nineteen years after these words of the Lord came into Peter’s mind, in his first general Epistle, he teaches water baptism to be an essential ordinance of the new testament. See 1 Pet. 3:21.

“So it is very evident that Peter never received any new light on the subject of baptism, causing him to turn antiordinance. Evidences from every direction prove the Quaker theories false.”

I shall next consider the leading argument put forth against baptism. It runs as follows: Peter was the apostle of the circumcision. To him was committed the “gospel of the circumcision.” Paul was the apostle of the uncircumcision. To him was committed the “gospel of the uncircumcision.” See Gal. 2:7, 8. Two gospels. The gospel of the circumcision

committed to Paul did not contain water baptism. istered to the Jews, while the gospel of uncircumcision committed to Paul did not contain water baptism. The whole argument is false. The following facts refute it:

1. *But one gospel was preached to both Jew and Gentile.* There is no such thing taught in the New Testament as two gospels—just “the gospel.” “Preach the gospel to every creature in all nations.” Both Paul and Peter labored under this same commission. The gospel that Peter delivered to the Jews was the same that Paul preached to the Gentiles. If, as false teachers say, Peter preached a different gospel from that which Paul preached, then he was “accursed.” Gal. 1:8, 9.

2. *The gospel that Peter preached included water baptism to both Jews and Gentiles.* Acts 2:5-14, 38, 39; 10:44-48. The gospel Paul preached included water baptism, and he practised what he preached. He baptized the household of Lydia (Acts 16:12-15), and also the jailer and his household. Acts 16:32, 33. The twelve disciples at Ephesus received baptism at the hands of Paul. Acts 19:1-6. Probably, all the foregoing were Jews. However, it is not certain whether the Philippian jailer was a Jew or a Gentile. It appears that he was a Gentile. Under Paul’s labors and preaching “many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.” Acts 18:8. In the language of Adam Clark, “these were evidently Gentiles”; for this was after the apostles

had turned to the Gentiles. Verse 6. So the gospel that Paul delivered embraced water baptism, and he administered it to both Jew and Gentile—same gospel to circumcision and uncircumcision, to Jew and Gentile. This fulfils the commission perfectly. “Go ye into all the world,” and “make disciples of all nations, baptizing them.” Mark 16:15, 16; Matt. 28:19, 20.

3. *That which Paul and Peter preached and practised was “gospel” (Gal. 2:7, 8), and not “law.”* This again proves that water baptism belongs to the new testament and is a Christian ordinance. The fact that Paul rebaptized the disciples at Ephesus proves that this holy man understood that there was a water baptism which did not begin and end with John the Baptist, but belonged exclusively to Christ.

I quote the following sound argument from “Ordinances of the New Testament”:

“Ordinance-opposers make a great hobby of Paul’s words in the first chapter of first Corinthians; but, as with other scriptures, they place a different construction upon them from that intended by Paul. Surely, it would not be reasonable to conclude that this great apostle taught against baptism in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, when his Roman Epistle, written a year later, clearly sets forth baptism as a Christian ordinance. See Rom. 6:4. Paul did not say, ‘I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius (1 Cor. 1:14),’ because he had received new light on the subject of baptism; but he himself as-

signs his reason for so saying, with his very next breath—‘Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.’ Verse 15.

“His words, ‘Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel’ (verse 17), prove nothing in favor of the antiordination heresy. If he was not sent to administer baptism, he was sent to preach the gospel, and was therefore sent to preach baptism; for baptism is a part of the gospel. If he had never baptized a single individual by his own hands, yet preached baptism, the arguments still lie on the side of baptism. But Paul testifies in the context that he did baptize Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas. This proves that though he was not specially sent to baptize, yet whenever there were no other brethren present to administer the baptism, he did the work himself. So in this, as in all other instances, the Quaker theory fades into oblivion.”

Some use Heb. 6:1, 2 to prove that baptism is done away. But where is the proof? If the text teaches that baptism is no more, then it teaches that laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment are all abolished.

The foregoing is sufficient proof for all those who have a disposition of heart to obey God. “If *any* man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy,

strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputing of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, . . . from such withdraw thyself." 1 Tim. 6:3-5.

II. THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Bible abounds with commemorative institutions. Knowing the frailty of man and his aptness to forget the importance of those events that should mostly concern us, God has established observances, the performance of which is intended to refresh our memories, to awaken our gratitude, and to minister to our happiness. The Jews had their feasts and memorial days—the feast of Pentecost, the feast of tabernacles, the Sabbath, and the Passover. Nations also have established their memorial days and holidays. In America we have our Fourth of July, Lincoln Day, and other memorial days, which point to important events in our own national history. In about all Christian nations religion has established its memorial days and feasts, as Christmas, Easter, Good Friday, etc. So the gospel, the grandest of all institutions, has not left us without its memorial days and observances. They were delivered to us in order to refresh our minds regarding the greatest events that have ever taken place in heaven or in earth. “The Lord’s day”—the greatest memorial day of the gospel, in honor of the resurrection of our glorious Lord; “the Lord’s Supper” in commemoration of his solemn death.

The term Lord’s Supper occurs in the Bible but once. Paul mentions it in his first letter to the Corinthians. “When ye come together therefore into one

place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper." 1 Cor. 11:20. It would appear from this language that the church at Corinth had substituted something to take the place of the true Lord's Supper that Paul had delivered to them, or else had added something to it that did not belong to the rite. Paul had delivered certain ordinances to them to observe (see verse 2), and he here mentions the Lord's Supper as one of them. This great ordinance has been observed by true Christians ever since the night of Christ's apprehension.

WHAT CONSTITUTES THE LORD'S SUPPER?

This has been a controverted point among many people; yet the teaching of the Bible in regard to it is very explicit. I will quote at length from the first Corinthian letter: "When ye come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. For I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me After

the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. . . . Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another. And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation. And the rest will I set in order when I come." 1 Cor. 11::20-34.

The apostle first shows what is not the Lord's Supper, then in contrast therewith proceeds to tell clearly what it is. Instead of bringing the elements—bread and wine—and partaking of them in a reverential manner, they brought victuals for a common meal and ate the supper as a common meal. This the apostle condemned in strong terms. Theirs was not a proper eating of the Lord's Supper. It seems clear from 1 Cor. 11:2 that this congregation observed the ordinances which Paul had delivered to them; but they added to the real Lord's Supper the eating of a full meal. This is exactly the position of the modern Dunkards. They bring together sufficient food to constitute an ordinary meal and eat to satisfy hunger. They, like the Corinthians, call this the Lord's Supper. The apostle is against them both. He says that their coming together "is not to eat the Lord's Supper." It is a substitution of human invention, and it is without any Scriptural authority. To all who contend for their full meal, the

apostle says, "What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God?" But should we not eat a meal and thus satisfy hunger? Hear the apostle's answer: "If any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation." Language could hardly be found to teach more clearly that the Lord's Supper is not a full meal. It is not a table where people may satisfy hunger. All full meals should be eaten "at home." To eat a full meal, and call it the Lord's Supper, is, the apostle tells us, to come "together unto condemnation" and to "despise the church of God."

After clearly showing that the Lord's Supper is not a full meal, the apostle proceeds to tell just what it consists of. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." You see, he had delivered to them this rite just as he received it from the Lord. That was the true Lord's Supper. What were its constituents? The apostle answers—"The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me." Verse 24. Next he mentions the cup as "the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Verses 25, 26. Thus, in clear, unmistakable language the apostle tells us that the bread and the wine constitute the Lord's Supper.

By carefully studying the commemorative institutions of the Bible, you will find the following points clearly defined: 1. The element used; 2. The thing to be done; 3. The persons to do them; 4. The time to do them; 5. The place to do them; 6. The purpose for which they are done. With reference to the Lord's Supper, we have clear answers to all these points. 1. The elements are bread and wine. 2. The thing to be done is to eat and drink these elements. 3. The persons to do this are true Christians—those who can eat and drink worthily. 4. The time to do this is toward evening—expressed by the term supper. 5. The place to do it is in the public assembly of the saints. 6. The object in it is to “show the Lord's death till he comes.”

We have the following facts: There is a Christian rite in the church of God called the Lord's Supper. God's people are commanded to partake of the bread and wine in remembrance of Christ's death. Nowhere are they commanded to partake of any other elements. This being true, the bread and the wine taken in commemoration of the death of our dear Lord are the Lord's Supper.

LORD'S SUPPER AND COMMUNION ARE THE SAME.

We have seen that the bread and the cup constitute the Lord's Supper, and now we shall prove that the same elements make up the communion. “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of

the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? for we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." 1 Cor. 10:16, 17. The apostle here has reference to the sacred commemorative rite instituted by the Savior for the church to observe, of which he tells us they all partook. He terms it "the communion" no doubt because of the sacredness and the blessedness of its observance. The reader will observe that the apostle mentions only the "cup" and the "bread" as the true communion supper. Any addition to this is of human invention. The modern meal observance is a blot on the sacredness that attaches to this solemn institution. No doubt many of its advocates are sincere, yet in their ignorance they, like the Corinthian church, despise the church of God and are condemned.

DID CHRIST AND HIS DISCIPLES EAT THE PASSEVER?

The heading of this chapter may appear to some like an idle question; but it is of no little consequence, in view of the fact that there are thousands of religionists who teach that it should be answered in the negative. It is held that the meal which Christ and his disciples ate was a new institution, the new testament Lord's Supper. One Dunkard preacher in my presence declared over and over that Christ did not eat the passover with his disciples the night of

his betrayal. We have but to attend to the evidences in the case, and this modern doctrine fades into oblivion.

“Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover? And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the Passover.

“Now when the even was come, he sat down with the Twelve. And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, That one of you shall betray me.” Matt. 26:17-21.

“And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the Passover? And he sendeth forth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him. And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples? And he will show you a large upper room furnished and prepared: there make ready for us. And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the

Passover. And in the evening he cometh with the Twelve. And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me." Mark 14:12-28.

"Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the Passover, that we may eat. And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare. And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he entereth in. And ye shall say unto the good man of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples? And he shall show you a large upper room furnished: there make ready. And they went, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the Passover. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat any more thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Luke 22:7-16.

The foregoing language is too plain to be misunderstood. Here is the testimony of three inspired men that Christ and his disciples ate the Passover. Let us carefully analyze the account. 1. The day had arrived in which the passover "*must be killed*," the the first day of unleavened bread, *when they killed*

the passover." 2. The disciples asked Jesus, "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?" 3. "He sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the Passover, that we may eat." 4. He told them to tell the man at whose house they were to prepare, "*I will keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples.*" "*I shall eat the Passover with my disciples.*" If as some say, he did not eat the Passover, then he told a positive falsehood. But he told the truth, though it makes men who contradict him liars. 5. "*And they made ready the Passover.*" 6. In the evening he came and "sat down, and the twelve apostles with him." 7. As they sat at the table, "He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer." 8. "*They did eat.*" And while they were eating, he said, "I will not eat any more thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Comments are unnecessary. To deny that Christ and his disciples ate the Passover is to indulge in the height of folly and to betray extreme ignorance.

This was the last Passover. It was to be eaten no more until fulfilled in the kingdom of God. You see, the Passover was one of the types of the old testament. It pointed to Christ. For the Passover they slew a male lamb without blemish. Exod. 12:5. Christ is said to be "a lamb without blemish" (1 Pet. 1:19), "the Lamb of God" (John 1:29), "a lamb as it had been slain." Rev. 5:6. It was called "the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover." Exod. 12:27.

So "Christ . . . hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God." Eph. 5:2. Thus, "Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. 5:7. The paschal lamb was slain about 3 P. M. Jesus, the true paschal Lamb, died the ninth hour (Mark 15:25-38), or 3 P. M. Of the Passover lamb it was said, "Neither shall ye break a bone thereof." Exod. 12:46. Christ's bones were not broken, "that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken." John 19:31-36. They ate the lamb literally. We eat Christ, our passover, spiritually. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." John 6:53, 55. They ate the passover with unleavened bread. Exod. 12:15. Now we partake of Christ, our passover, "with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." See 1 Cor. 5:6-8. In the first Passover every house received an individual application of the blood of the lamb upon the posts and lintels of its doors. Exod. 12:22. Now every man must have a personal application of the blood of Christ to his own heart, or the death of Christ will avail him nothing. In the Passover the blood was a token. "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where you are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you when I smite the land of Egypt." Exod. 12:13. So in the awful day of wrath that is coming, nothing but the blood will

preserve us and cause the awful indignation of the Almighty to pass over us. This explains Jesus' words, "until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." He and his disciples ate the last typical Passover. Just a few hours afterward, he himself, the true passover, was slain. Then was the type fulfilled "in the kingdom of God."

The leading objection brought up is what John says regarding the Jews. He says, "Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the Passover." John 18:28. This was the next morning after Jesus and his disciples had eaten the Passover, and it appears that the Jews had not yet eaten it. Some have explained this by the fact that the feast of the Passover lasted for eight days (see Exod. 12:18-20). According to this explanation, the fear of the Jews lest they should be debarred through defilement from eating the Passover, referred more especially to the remainder of the feast than to the eating of the paschal lamb. This may be true, yet in John 19:14 the apostle says that "it was the preparation of the Passover." The apparent conflict between the three other Gospels and that of John has puzzled commentators for centuries. Many different theories have been advanced by the best scholars of the times. It is not very clear whether the Jews ate their Passover at a later date than that specified in the law. They had at this time

adopted many customs not in strict harmony with the law. One thing is clear—Christ and his disciples ate the Passover, and, according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, they ate it at the correct time. I here insert the opinion of Dr. Adam Clark:

“It is a common opinion that our Lord ate the Passover some hours before the Jews ate it; for the Jews, according to custom, ate theirs at the end of the fourteenth day, but Christ ate his the preceding even, which was the beginning of the same day, or Friday; the Jews begin their day at sun setting, we at midnight. Thus, Christ ate the Passover on the same day with the Jews, but not on the same hour. Christ kept the Passover the beginning of the fourteenth day, the precise day and hour in which the Jews had eaten their first Passover in Egypt. See Exod. 12: 6-12.”—*Notes on Matt. 26: 20.*

It seems clear that at the very time when it was customary for the Jews to kill their passover, Jesus, our passover, was sacrificed for us. Thus was the type fulfilled. The innocent Lamb of God was made the world's great atonement, the final passover, sacrificed for us all.



WHEN WAS THE LORD'S SUPPER INSTITUTED?

“The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread,” etc. 1 Cor. 11: 23. Those who oppose the ordinances claim that this was but a part

of the Jewish Passover service; but we have seen in the previous chapter that the Passover service ended at the cross, being fulfilled in Christ. That literal feast ceased to be observed from the time that the great antitype—Christ—the true passover, was slain. Of course, the ignorant Jews who rejected the Savior continued to offer lambs as long as the temple remained standing; but God gave no recognition to any such offerings after Jesus, expiring on the cross, cried, "It is finished."

Twenty-six years after the old Passover service had ended, Paul said, "I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you," then mentioned the fact that the same night of Christ's betrayal by Judas, Christ broke the bread and also gave them the cup, saying, "This do in remembrance of me." "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." Matt. 26:26-30. Mark records it in about the same language. "As they did eat," or "were eating," Jesus took bread, broke it, and gave it to them. Likewise the cup. After

which he said to them, "This do in remembrance of me."

Before this, Jesus had pointed out the betrayer. Matt. 26:21-28. While they were eating the Passover, Jesus said to them, "Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born. Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said." Remember, this took place during the eating of the Passover, before he had broken the bread and given them the cup. Now, John, who endeavored to supply what the others had omitted, tells us what took place immediately after Judas was pointed out. "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake. Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned unto him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake. He then lying on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when

I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And after the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, That thou doest do quickly. . . . He then having received the sop *went immediately* out: and it was night." John 13:21-30. As the Jews ate the Passover in families, it was inconvenient for all of them to dip their bread into the same dish: therefore it became customary to have several small dishes. Some of these dishes contained the bitter herbs and others the broth procured by roasting the lamb in the fire. Judas dipped in the same dish with Christ. Matt. 26:23. Thus Christ gave him a sop and pointed him out to John as the betrayer; and mark the fact that "*immediately*" he went out into the night on his mission to betray the Son of God.

Now, after all this, Jesus instituted the holy communion supper. It was at the close of the Passover supper, or just as they were finishing that meal. See Luke 22:19-20. Judas was not present at the institution of this sacred rite, which is to be administered only to those who are worthy. In an upper room in Jerusalem, assembled with his own disciples, on the most solemn night that Christ ever spent upon earth, the night before his awful death on the cross, he instituted and delivered to his true followers the communion supper, enjoining it with this command: "This do in remembrance of me."

IT IS AN ORDINANCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Among Webster's definitions of the word ordinance are these: "An observance commanded"; "an established rite or ceremony." Jesus broke literal bread and gave it to his disciples; also, he gave them the literal fruit of the vine. Matt. 26:29. Thus, he instituted a literal practise, or rite, and then enjoined it upon the church by a positive command—"This do in remembrance of me." Immediately after this, before leaving the room (John 14:31), he emphasized this command by saying: "If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John 14:15); "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me" (Verse 21); "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (Verse 23); "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings." Verse 24. Surely, this is sufficient to give impressiveness to the sacred command, "This do in remembrance of me." We prove our love to God by doing what he said. Of all ordinance-opposers Jesus said, "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings." With their mouths they may show much love, but their hearts are corrupt; "for they hear thy words, but they do them not." Ezek. 33:31, 32. With all their profession of piety, they are void of salvation.

Four inspired writers have delivered to us accounts of the institution of this rite—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul. Matthew was an eye-witness, while Mark

and Luke were apostolic men and received the account from the apostles themselves. Paul declares that he received this ordinance direct from the Lord. Note the fact that, while Paul was a Jew, he had not received this rite by tradition from the fathers nor had he read it in Moses' law; but he received it direct from the Lord and then delivered it to the Corinthian church. "For I have *received of the Lord* that which also I delivered unto you." Then he mentions the Lord's Supper. "I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you." 1 Cor. 11:2. This was twenty-six years after the law of Moses had been abrogated. A careful reading of the accounts given by these four inspired writers shows that they all perfectly agree as to the constituents and the design of the ordinance. 'They tell us that Jesus instituted it of the product of the field and of the fruit of vine and that it is a monument erected in remembrance of his death.'

The very language of Jesus in instituting the rite, shows clearly to which dispensation it belongs. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood *of the new testament*, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. 26:27, 28. "And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many." Mark 14:24. "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Luke 22:20. "This cup is the new

testament in my blood." 1 Cor. 11:25. All four inspired writers are particular to tell us that this rite is of *the new testament*. They do this by giving the exact words of Jesus. Every time ordinance-opposers say that it belonged to the old testament, they utter a positive falsehood right in the face of Jesus Christ, who said that it is of "the new testament." Being a new covenant institution, it is obligatory upon all God's people. To refuse to observe it is to be guilty of sin against God. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. Sinning, or transgressing God's law, is done in two ways—by doing what Christ forbids or by refusing to do what he enjoins. Thus, all ordinance-fighters are sinners. I know this sounds hard to them, but if not before, they will awaken to it in the great day of judgment.

Again, it is argued that Christ broke bread and gave his disciples the cup before his death and that therefore this ordinance is no longer binding. This is a very weak objection; for as we have seen in a previous part of the book, all the principles of the new testament (gospel) were of necessity delivered before Christ's death, or the death of the Testator. By the same line of reasoning the abolition of the entire new testament could be proved. It was all introduced before the Savior's death. Notice! Jesus instituted this rite the same day (according to Jewish reckoning) of his death. He said to his disciples, "Do this in remembrance of me." If it was abol-

ished at his death, when had the disciples opportunity to obey his command?

Again, what event in the life of Christ were they to commemorate in this ordinance? "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death." Mark the words "as often." This shows that he intended them to observe it frequently. Since they had neither time nor opportunity to obey the command before his death, it must be clear to all that Christ intended them to observe it after his death and ascension to heaven. Such is the right and only conclusion. It is commemorative of Christ's death. This could not, you see, be commemorated before it took place. So since the death of Jesus we observe the sacred rite in remembrance of his death. Remembrance means keeping in mind; recollection; memorial; token. The fact that our Savior commanded us to "do this" in recollection of his death, or as a token of the same, proves unquestionably that it was to be observed after his death and that it is an ordinance of the new testament.

The apostles so understood it, for we find them afterwards teaching and practising this ordinance. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." Acts 20:7. It is generally accepted by scholars and commentators that the breaking of bread mentioned here was the regular communion supper. The very earliest writ-

ings that have come down to us, the writings of the immediate successors of the apostles, abound in proof of the fact that the communion supper was literally kept by the primitive Christians. It was handed to them from the apostles by precept and example.

But say the advocates of Quakerism. "We do observe it spiritually." They say that they eat the spiritual bread from heaven and in a spiritual way drink the blood of Christ. In proof of this they quote John 6:53-58. This they connect with the communion supper and then say that it is not literal, but spiritual. For the benefit of the reader I will give the text in full. "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of God, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live forever." Rev. 3:20 is also quoted to prove a spiritual observance. That text reads thus: "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me." I find such a clear answer

to this in "Ordinances of the New Testament" that I take the liberty to insert it here:

"That these texts teach a sublime spiritual feast to be enjoyed by faithful Christians is indisputable; but they afford us no proof that there is no literal ordinance called the Lord's Supper. We should apply such texts as speak of literal things to literal things. It is both erroneous and absurd to attempt to identify scriptures which speak of literal things with those which speak of spiritual things.

"The Bible student will observe the following clear distinctions between the feast of the foregoing texts and the ordinance instituted by our Lord the night of his betrayal:

"1. The one is spiritual; the other literal.

"2. The scriptures which record the spiritual supper will not admit of literalizing; while those scriptures which record the literal supper will not admit of spiritualizing.

"3. The scriptures which speak of the spiritual supper are addressed to sinners; while those which speak of the literal supper are addressed to Christians.

"4. The spiritual supper is a continuous feast. When we open our heart unto Him who stands and knocks at the door, he does not come in as a guest to dine with us and then depart; but he says, 'We will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' John 14:23. The literal supper is to be eaten at intervals. 'This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in re-

membrance of me.' 1 Cor. 11:25. 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup,' etc. Verse 26.

"5. The terms Lord's supper and communion are applied to the literal ordinance, but never to the spiritual feast of the soul.

"6. Of the literal supper men may partake unworthily (1 Cor. 11:27), but of the spiritual supper none but the worthy can partake. 1 Cor. 10:21.

"Can the communion supper, in any case, be observed in a spiritual manner? No, because the institution of it was literal. A spiritual observance can never be reckoned in obedience to a commandment to imitate a literal exemplification. Had Jesus exemplified in a spiritual manner the communion supper (a thing indeed impossible), it would have been of a spiritual nature and could have been observed only in a spiritual manner. Or if, when he had literally exemplified this ordinance, he had made the statement that he was intending only to teach a spiritual lesson, he would have instituted a spiritual ordinance; and we could, without difficulty, have understood that it was to be spiritually observed. But he gave us no such instructions; but when he administered literal bread and literal wine, he commanded, saying 'This do in remembrance of me,' and this can be obeyed only by partaking of literal emblems such as Jesus administered."

HOW LONG SHALL ITS OBSERVANCE CONTINUE?

The fact that this rite is of the new testament suggests that its observance is to continue to the end of time. The new covenant is an everlasting covenant. It was sealed and ratified with the precious blood of Christ. As long as that covenant is of force, its observances are binding upon the church of God. Christ commanded his disciples to keep this ordinance (Luke 22:19), and then when he gave them the great commission, he commanded them to teach others to observe it. "Teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." You see, the condition upon which the Lord has promised to be with his people is that they observe all things commanded; and they must do this until the end of the world. Coming directly to the ordinance under consideration, the apostle plainly tells us just how long its observance is to continue. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11:26. Yes, "*till he come.*" It is to be observed right up till the second coming of Christ. In obedience to the sacred injunction of the Lord, his followers will continue to keep the rite until he comes.

WHAT IT TEACHES.

Every ordinance of God is instituted for a purpose. Each is intended to teach us some lesson or lessons

that will be conducive to our spiritual prosperity. This rite, when fully understood, is a very sacred one; for that which it teaches, attaches great solemnity to its observance. "The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." Do it "*in remembrance* of me." As before observed, remembrance means keeping in mind; recollection; memorial; token; souvenir; remembrancer. A dying mother leaves her son a little token, a keepsake to remember her by. It may be her Bible. Now, although he would probably never forget his mother, yet amid the cares and the responsibilities of life, he is apt in time to largely forget; but every time he looks at that token and takes his mother's Bible in his hands, it refreshes his memory, and scenes of childhood at mother's knee, boyhood's gleeful days around the fireside at home, the prayers and the tears of dear old mother, and a hundred other like things fill his mind. It serves as a remembrancer; it is a token that brings vividly to mind things that might be otherwise forgotten. So the good Lord, just before his death, left us this token by which to commemorate his death. He knew the frailty of man and his aptness amid life's cares and responsibilities to

forget; therefore his wisdom left us this little token of his love to remember him by. And as we gather around the Lord's table and commune together, memory goes back to dark Gethsemane. There we see the man of sorrows lying prostrate under the heavy load of the sins of the whole world. We hear his groans and cries, his pleadings that the bitter cup of death may pass from him; but we also hear him say in humble submission, "Thy will be done."

Oh, how this scene awakens in our hearts a desire to love and serve him better! From the depths of our souls we cry, "I will be true to him. I will suffer for his sake." Then as we break and partake of the bread, we see Jesus' body, all lacerated by the awful scourging of the Roman soldiers; we see him give way under the cross; and finally, in vision, we behold his mangled body hanging upon the rugged cross. Oh, how vivid become those solemn and awful scenes! And then it was all for us—all that we might be saved! Such love melts our hearts and brings us closer to him. Then as we take the cup and drink of the blood of grapes, before our vision appears a humble form with a crown of thorns upon his brow, and we see the crimson blood flow down over his brow and stain his lovely face. As the cruel spikes are driven into his hands and feet, we see the precious blood flow freely. Then we remember that our salvation cost that very blood. The very thought of this brings us more humbly and more closely to the feet of Jesus. It awakens in us a deeper

appreciation of God's goodness and love. Thank God for this last token he left us! We will eat and drink in remembrance of him.

"For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11:26. This rite is a monument erected to commemorate the sufferings and the death of Christ. Every time we eat the bread and drink the cup, we "do show the Lord's death," the sacrificial death of the world's Redeemer. Notice the language—"The bread which we break." 1 Cor. 10:16. The word bread here should be loaf, and it is so rendered by several translators. In sectism the bread is cut into small bits and then handed out to the communicants. This destroys the lesson intended to be taught. In the communion services held by the primitive Christians one loaf was distributed to them all. It was broken and given to the participants. So also when Jesus instituted this ordinance, "he took bread and break it." When the loaf is broken, it represents—exhibits, expresses, portrays—the broken and mangled body of Christ on the cross. In this way we show his death. The wine is termed the blood of grapes. Gen. 49:11. As we partake of it, we show the death of the Savior, in that the wine is a figure of the precious blood he shed. It represents that blood. The communion, then, is an ordinance instituted by the Savior to show forth his death till he comes again.

There are also other lessons in it for the church.

“The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.” 1 Cor. 10:16, 17. As we gather around the Lord’s table, we behold an unbroken loaf. When we look upon it, we are reminded that “we, being many, are one bread, and one body.” Many different grains of wheat were brought together and now they constitute one undivided loaf. So we—the church of God—being many individual members, are all brought together into one body, are all made one. Thus the unity of the church is clearly seen. We who partake of the communion bread and wine in commemoration of the sacrificial death of Christ are one spiritual society, “one body in Christ.” But how were we made so? Answer: “We are all partakers of that one bread”; namely, have all partaken of that one Christ, whose blood was shed to make an atonement for our sins. Partaking of that “living bread” which came down from heaven, is the very thing that makes us one. In this blessed state of holy unity we gather around the “Lord’s table” in sweet communion. As we break bread and drink of the cup, we commune together. It also brings us into a closer and sweeter communion with our Lord.

WHO ARE WORTHY?

This ordinance was instituted to be observed by the church of God. This being true, only such as are members of that church are worthy to participate. The question, then, is, Who are members of the church? "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." Acts 2:47. "Those that were being saved."—*Revised Version*. Church-members are saved people. The moment a person is converted and his sins are washed away, he becomes a member of the church of God. For such this rite was established. All saved people are worthy to partake of the Lord's table.

"Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. 11:27. Since only saved people are worthy, all unsaved people are unworthy. The unworthy class includes all sinners, whether professors or non-professors. Oh! the millions of sinful professors who partake of the bread and cup unworthily—many who **will not** speak to their fellow men and others who do not claim to live above sin. Filled with pride, stylish ladies make communion-day a time for displaying their fine hats, jewelry, and latest fashions. This is generally true everywhere in sect Babylon. These professors are "guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord." To eat and drink unworthily is to be as guilty as the murderous Jews who cried, "Away with him! Let him be crucified." Such ungodly

professors will be found in the day of judgment with their hands red with the blood of Christ. They will then say, "When nailed we thee to the cross? when pressed we the crown of thorns upon thy head? when smote we thee with the palms of our hands? when shed we thy innocent blood?" Then will he answer and say unto them, "As often as ye ate the bread, and drank the cup of the Lord, unworthily, ye were guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord."

"But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. 11:28, 29. It behooves men and women to carefully examine their hearts and lives and to be sure that they have God's approval upon them. All that eat and drink unworthily not only thus become guilty of the blood of Christ, but also eat and drink "damnation" to themselves. They come together "unto condemnation." This is true of all that do not discern the Lord's body. Some have thought that by the Lord's body is meant the church. This, however, is not clear; for there have been thousands of saved people in sectism who never clearly discerned the body of Christ—the church—yet who, being saved, and walking in all the light they had, ate and drank worthily. By the Lord's body in the above text is meant his sacrificial body in the forgiveness of our sins.

"THIS IS MY BODY"; "THIS IS MY BLOOD."

These words, employed by our Savior when he instituted this rite, have been used by thousands of religionists as a foundation for much erroneous teaching and rank heresy. Upon them is built the Catholic absurdity of transubstantiation and also the Protestant idea of receiving forgiveness of sins through the sacrament. It is our object in this chapter to set the matter forth in its true light and at the same time to refute erroneous ideas handed down to the people from the dark ages of superstition and apostate night.

I will first consider the Catholic idea; for this is the fountain from which flow all the heretical notions entertained in Protestant sectism. I insert the following from the Catholic catechism: "Q. What is the holy eucharist? A. It is a sacrament, which contains the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, under the form and appearances of bread and wine. Q. Is it not bread and wine which is first put upon the altar for the celebration of the mass? A. Yes; it is always bread and wine till the priest pronounces the words of consecration during the mass. Q. What happens by these words? A. The bread is changed into the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into his blood. Q. What is this change called? A. It is called transubstantiation; that is to say, a change of one substance into another."

The Council of Trent at its thirteenth session

passed the following canons, which are supremely authoritative with Roman Catholics:

“*Canon 1.* Whosoever shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and consequently Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign and figure, or by his power; let him be accursed.

“*2.* Whosoever shall affirm, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there remains the substance of the bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall deny that wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most fitly terms transubstantiation; let him be accursed.

“*3.* Whosoever shall deny that Christ entire is contained in the venerable sacrament of the eucharist, under each species, and under every part of each species when they are separated; let him be accursed.”

The foregoing clearly sets forth their doctrine. If space would permit, I should like to set before the reader the Catholic “sacrifice of mass” and show the awful blasphemy contained therein. They hold that it is a propitiatory offering of Christ, the same as his offering upon the cross of Calvary; that the

sacrifice of mass is offering him up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for both the living and the dead, in as true a manner as he was offered on the cross at Jerusalem; and that it is equally meritorious with his first sacrifice. Here are the canons of the Council of Trent:

“*Canon 1.* If any one shall say, that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the mass: or that what is to be offered is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat; let him be accursed.

“*2.* If any one shall say, that by these words, ‘Do this for a commemoration of me,’ Christ did not appoint his apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood; let him be accursed.

“*3.* If any one shall say, that the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be accursed.”

Catholics contend that Christ is offered daily in the mass sacrifice. In this they contradict the apostle Paul, who said, “For by *one* offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” Heb. 10:14. “Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often

have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. . . . So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9:25-28. There was but *one* offering of Christ for remission.

The Catholic mass is pure blasphemy. The Catholic doctrine is this: The priest takes a piece of substance—something which the farmer grows in his field, a part of which the hogs, cattle, sheep, and horses eat—lays it upon an altar, pronounces a few words of consecration over it—and suddenly it turns into a god! There is no bread nor wine left on the table after the words of consecration. It is now Christ—"Christ entire," "the body, soul, blood, and divinity of Jesus Christ." Next the priest falls before it and worships it, then holds it up before his congregation, saying to them in Latin (which interpreted is), "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Then they all bow their heads in reverence and worship. After this the priest and the people eat it—swallow it down into their stomachs. In all this the priest makes an offering, a sacrificial offering of Christ for the sins of both the dead and the living. God help men to see the heinous idolatry and blasphemy of this so-called sacrament! They make a god with their own hands out of the same substance that the stock in the barnyard eat. Then they fall down and worship that god. They offer it up for their sins. Then they eat their god. The rankest

pagan in the world has never done such a thing. Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans—all consider the eating of Divinity a horribly profane thing. The Catholics' god is a piece of bread; and, to add to their idolatry and blasphemy, they call that bread "the very Christ."

The Lutherans hold that Christ's presence is in the communion. They differ with the Catholics in that they do not believe it is the literal body and blood of Christ that they eat. The Lutheran doctrine is as follows: It still remains bread and wine; but the Word connects with the bread and wine the presence of Christ himself, and in partaking of the communion, we partake spiritually of the body and the blood of the Lord. In so doing, we receive remission of past sins.

Most sects teach that when the bread and the wine are consecrated or blessed in prayer, there is a supernatural presence of Christ in the same, and that special blessing is conferred on the partakers. "Jesus took bread and *blessed* it." Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22. It is held that by the term blessed is meant that Jesus somehow changed the bread, consecrated it, or connected his spiritual presence therewith, and that in partaking of it grace is ministered. Thus, about all sects hold that the sacrament is a special means of grace.

Beloved reader, this is attaching more to the communion than the Lord ever intended. There is no foundation in the Scriptures for such notions. The

word blessed in the above texts means no more than that he gave thanks. Matthew and Mark say that he blessed the bread; while Luke, recording the same things, says, "He took bread, *and gave thanks*, and brake it." Luke 22:19. "The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and *when he had given thanks*, he brake it, and said, Take, eat." 1 Cor. 11:23, 24. "Jesus taking a loaf, and giving praise, he broke, and gave it to the disciples."—*Emphatic Diaglott*, Matt. 26:26. This clearly disproves the idea that Jesus conferred any special virtue to the communion bread. He simply broke a loaf and "gave thanks." "After the same manner" "he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them." 1 Cor. 11:25; Matt. 26:27. It remained bread in his hands after he had given thanks. "Jesus took bread," "gave thanks, and break *it*, and gave *it* to the disciples." After thanks have been offered, it is only "bread which we break." 1 Cor. 10:16. This fact is further proved by Christ's own words. "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God." Mark 14:25. The thing, then, that we drink is "the fruit of the vine." Bread and wine constitute the communion, or Lord's Supper—just simply bread and the juice of the grape.

But why did he say, "This is my body; this is my blood"? I answer, He spoke by figure. The figure is this: The bread and the wine are *symbols*, or *emblems*, of the broken body and the shed blood of

Christ. It is the height of folly to put any other construction upon Christ's words. He could not have meant his literal body, for the following reasons:

1. At the time when he spoke these words, he was alive before them. It is impossible that the apostles could have believed that they were eating the body of Christ when they saw that body sitting before them. He held the broken loaf in his own hands. With their eyes they looked upon his fleshly body seated at the table with them. How could they have believed that they were drinking his blood, when as they knew, it was still in his veins? Incredible!

2. How could they have been persuaded to drink the literal blood of their Lord or to eat human flesh—to swallow their Lord and Master down their throats? Such teaching is ridiculous in the extreme.

3. It could not have been his body broken and his shed blood that they partook of; for he was at this very time alive before them. His body had not yet been given, sacrificed, or broken, for them. This shows that it is impossible to take our Savior's words in a literal sense. Catholics say that the bread and the wine contain the body, soul, blood, and divinity of Christ. How, I ask, could the loaf of bread in Jesus' hand have contained his soul, when his soul was yet in his visible body? How could the cup have contained his blood, when his blood was yet coursing through his veins, and not one drop had yet been shed?

4. Their own sense of taste would have convinced them that it was not literal flesh that they were eating nor literal blood that they were drinking.

Let us analyze, and get the true meaning. Jesus had nothing in his hand but a literal loaf of bread. He gave thanks, then broke the bread, and gave it to the disciples, and they did eat. Paul plainly says that it is bread which we break. He also says that it is bread, or one loaf, of which we partake. 1 Cor. 10:16, 17. In 1 Cor. 11:26, 27, 28, the apostle three times declares that it is simply bread which we eat in the communion supper. "As often as ye eat this *bread*." You see, it is not the very Christ that we eat, neither literal nor spiritual, but unleavened bread. Nor is it blood, literal or spiritual, that we drink; but it is the literal "fruit of the vine." Mark 14:25. Jesus then said of a literal loaf of unleavened bread, "This is my body." Of the cup of literal grape-juice he said, "This is my blood." Since, as before observed, the words of Christ can not be taken in a literal sense, they must be understood figuratively. Bread and wine were apt symbols, signs, emblems, or representations, of his broken body and shed blood. The broken bread in his hand represented his body, which in a few hours was to be crucified. The cup represented his blood, which was soon to be shed. I repeat: Since at the time Christ instituted this rite he was actually alive, the bread could not have been naturally or really his body; but it was a figure, or representation, of his body, which was shortly to be

given, or broken, on the cross for us. And the wine could not have actually been his blood; but it was instituted then as the perpetual representation and memorial of his shed blood, which was soon to be separated from his body on the cross.

Wine, by way of figure, is called "the blood of grapes." Gen. 49:11. Deut. 32:14. How fittingly, then, it represents the blood of Christ! But some one will ask, "Is the sign of a thing ever called by the same name as the thing it signifies?" Certainly. It is so in our common language. In my room is an enlarged picture of my dead father and mother. Pointing to the picture, I say to a friend, "This is my father and mother." Who would be so stupid as to believe the picture to be really my father and mother—their actual body, blood, and soul? Who would believe them to be there literally or even spiritually? The picture is only a representation of them. I say of a map hanging on the wall, "This is the United States." Who would understand it to be the real country itself? Nobody. It is only a representation of it. Just so, Jesus took a loaf of bread, broke it, and said, "This is my body." That bread was no more his spiritual or literal body than the portrait on the wall is the real persons themselves. The bread just *represented* his body.

The very mode of expression Jesus used is the common language of Scripture. I will here cite a few examples of its use. "The seven good kine are seven years." "The seven good ears are seven years."

Gen. 41:26. While it is plainly said that seven kine and seven ears *are* seven years, it is plain that the meaning is that the kine and the ears represent years. Again, "The three branches are three days." Gen. 40:12. "The three baskets are three days." Ver. 18. The branches and the baskets represent days. "Thou art this head of gold." Dan. 2:38. That is, the head of gold represented Nebuchadnezzar and the great kingdom of Babylon. "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth." Dan. 7:17. Who believes that real beasts were once kings of the earth? Yet the language is as positive as Jesus' language in the communion institution. "These great beasts *are* four kings." The beasts represent kings. "The ten horns" "are ten kings." Dan. 7:24. "That rock was Christ." 1 Cor. 10:4. "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches." "And the seven candlesticks" "are the seven churches." Rev. 1:20. "The seven heads are seven mountains." Rev. 17:9. "I am the vine, ye are the branches." John 15:5. In all these the sign has the name of the thing signified. Parallel with all the above figures, are Christ's words when he instituted the communion supper. The bread, when broken, represents the broken body of our Savior; the blood of grapes represents his shed blood. The whole is a remembrancer of his death.

III. FEET-WASHING.

We will now consider a subject upon which much has been written, mostly in a negative way. This rite is probably spurned and made light of by professed Christians more than all the other commands of the Savior combined. The very arguments that antiordinance people use against baptism and the Lord's Supper most professors who defend these two ordinances will use against this institution of Christ. Why this inconsistency? The best solution that I can give is the reason assigned by Paul in Rom. 8:7—"Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Sect Babylon is full of men and women who are carnal and sold under sin. It is no great surprise, then, that in these last days of perilous times professors of religion will set at naught, reject, deny, and even oppose some part of God's Word that does not suit their perverted ideas or carnal minds. It is but the natural outcropping of their carnal condition to oppose the practise of any precept of the New Testament that does not suit them in their pride and vanity or that does not meet the approval of the world.

But to all who love the Lord "his commandments are not grievous." You see, "he that is of God heareth God's words." This is the test between the true and the false professed followers of Christ. All

who are of God are ready and willing to keep the sayings of Christ; but to those who refuse to do so Jesus says, "Ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." John 8:47. Men may profess great piety and love, but if they reject teachings of Jesus, they are deceived in their profession. "But be ye doers of the word and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." Jas. 1:22. Just as soon as men refuse to obey any part of the teachings of Christ, they become deceived. Next they get contentious. "But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth." Rom. 2:8. Such will begin to try to explain away the sayings of Jesus and to contend that these are not to be observed. When you read them the simple declarations of truth, they will reason around them, try to explain them away, contending that they are non-essentials anyway. When people go thus far and yet profess to follow Christ, they become a prey to evil spirits and fall under the power of Anti-christ. "Who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth?" Gal. 3:1. "The prince of the power of the air," that is, the devil, is "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Eph. 2:2. If not before, people will discover in the great day of judgment that the Lord said what he meant, and meant what he said. Them "that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ" will, in that day, be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1:7-9.

But I hear some one ask, "Must we observe *all things* that Jesus commanded?" Answer: "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke 6:46. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Jas. 2:10. Oh, the multitude of deceived professors of religion who in the day of judgment will stand guilty at the bar of truth! You might keep all the other ordinances and commands of Christ, have a great zeal for religious things, yet if you refuse to obey in one point, you are as guilty as though you transgressed every command in the New Testament—"guilty of all." Adam transgressed only in one point, and he was driven from paradise. King Saul obeyed all that was commanded except one thing, and for that one act of disobedience God departed from him and gave his kingdom to another. Failing to obey in one point cost a prophet of Judah his life. 1 Kings 13. O reader, "To obey is better than sacrifice." "He [Christ] became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Heb. 5:9. Thank God! The obedient are possessors of "*eternal* salvation." "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:14.

FEET-WASHING COMMANDED.

In the last commission to his ministers Jesus enjoined upon them to teach the people to "observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you"; and upon conditions that they should do this, he promised to be with them always, "even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:19, 20. The "all things" include feet-washing; for it is one of the things Jesus commanded. In proof of this I call the attention of the reader to the words of Christ as recorded in the Gospel of John, chapter 13:12-17—"So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done unto you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."

Surely, no one will deny that Christ literally washed his disciples' feet. He laid aside his outer garments, took a towel and girded himself with it, poured water into a basin, washed his disciples' feet, then wiped them with the towel with which he was girded. This is so simple and plain that all can understand it. He washed their feet with his hands

in literal water. After doing this, he sat down again and addressed them thus: "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am." In this he sets before them the fact of his authority. That which he instituted and commanded has back of it the highest authority known to man, the highest in the universe—that of the Lord of glory. Their acknowledging him as their Lord was virtually acknowledging that what he commanded them to do must be observed. "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." Plainer, clearer language could not be framed to enjoin an observance or practise, than that Jesus employed when he charged upon his disciples the performance of the rite of feet-washing. He employed two of the strongest words in language to make this rite binding upon us, so that we might feel the obligation to observe it. These words are "ought" and "should." "Ye also *ought* to wash one another's feet." "I have given you an example, that ye *should* do as I have done unto you."

OUGHT—"To be held or bound in duty or moral obligation."—*Webster*.

SHOULD—"It denotes obligation or duty."—*Webster*.

OUGHT, *opheilo*—"To owe; to be indebted; to be bound to the performance of some duty; to be obliged; to be under obligation."—*Greenfield*.

UGHT, *opheilo*—"To owe; be indebted; to be under obligation, duty, or necessity."—*Donnegan*.

"It is used to command in the first person. Sometimes it is used for the imperative to convey a command or request in milder terms."—*Bullions' Greek Grammar*.

"Sometimes it is used to express a promise, volition, command or threat."—*Brown's English Grammar*.

I have referred to these authorities in order to show that as Jesus said to his disciples, "Ye *ought* to wash one another's feet," and then told them to teach the people of all nations to "observe *all things*" that he had commanded them, we are "bound in duty" and under "moral obligation" to observe this ordinance. There is no evasion of this fact.

But some object on the ground that Christ did not say "ye *must*." To this I reply: The new testament is a law of love. The precepts of the first covenant, or law, were enjoined with "thou shalt." They were enforced with stones and death. How different the spirit of the gospel! Observances are no longer made binding by such terms as "thou shalt" and "ye must," nor are they enforced with stones. The expression "ye must" is found but twice in the law of liberty—the New Testament. The gospel message runs thus: "If you love me, you will." No "thou shalt" nor "you musts," backed up by stones, are necessary to cause saints to keep the words of Christ. The fact that we *ought* and *should*

do his sayings is enough for those who love the Lord.

Many of the most important Christian duties are enjoined in the words "ye ought." Jesus reproved the Pharisees as follows: "Ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these *ought* ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." Matt. 23:23. "Men *ought* always to pray, and not to faint." Luke 18:1. "We *ought* to obey God." Acts 5:29. "Tell thee what thou *oughtest* to do." Acts 10:5. "So *ought* men to love their wives as their own bodies." Eph. 5:28. "Ye *ought* to say, If the Lord will." Jas. 4:15. "Beloved, if God so loved us, we *ought* also to love one another." 1 John 4:11. "Ye also *ought* to wash one another's feet." John 13:14. Everybody admits a duty in each of the above texts but the last. Everybody feels under obligation to obey them. But when it comes to the thirteenth of John, some will cry "Non-essential." God help men to be honest enough to admit the truth! Just as sure as we ought to obey God, pray, love our wives, and love our brethren, we "ought to wash one another's feet." It is a positive command of Christ. "And this is his commandment, that we *should* believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another." 1 John 3:23. It is also his commandment that we *should* wash one another's feet.

Notice, reader, the thing Jesus commanded us to do is clearly stated—"Wash one another's feet."

Surely, that is plain enough for any one to understand. If others will reject the truth and will not obey, I myself feel perfectly safe in doing what Jesus, my Lord and Master, has plainly said I ought and should do. Listen to what Jesus said, "Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, *and doeth them*, I will show you to whom he is like: he is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it: for it was founded upon a rock." Luke 6:47, 48. Many people say that they love the Lord. But Jesus laid down the real test—"He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." John 14:21. "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." John 15:14. Jesus said, "Wash one another's feet." But some will answer, "It is non-essential: I need not do it." To all such Jesus says, "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Yet they will say that they are saved; that they know God in the pardon of sins and the sanctification of their souls. Here is a text that contradicts them and that will bar them from heaven in the great day of judgment: "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John 2:4.

IT IS AN ORDINANCE.

All ordinances of God are established either by positive precept or by example. Though a rite be observed by people, yet if there is neither precept nor example in the Word of God for it, that rite is of human invention. To disregard such observances is not to be guilty of sin; "for where no law is, there is no transgression." There is no obedience in the performance of it nor any disobedience in the non-performance of it. All observances like this are non-essentials. Mere customs of the people, whether family customs, national customs, or universal customs, are not established by divine authority. If these customs do not conflict with pure religion, their practise is optional with the people. These customs, too, are non-essentials. But the feet-washing mentioned in the New Testament can not be classed with either of the foregoing. It is ratified both by clear example and by precept. I will here give the account of its institution by Christ:

"And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him; Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God; he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter said unto

him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For he knew who should betray him: therefore said he, Ye are not all clean. So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." John 13:2-17.

We have here every essential to an ordinance—

1. The acknowledged authority of him who delivered it, our "Master and Lord."

2. His example. After washing their feet, he said unto them, "I have given you an example." Example means model, pattern, or copy. This is so simple and plain that we can not mistake it. He washed the disciples' feet with literal water and

wiped them with a literal towel. This is the copy, pattern, or model, that we are to follow.

3. His practise. He first did the thing himself. That which he did was something which had never been practised before as he here practised it.

4. Jesus gave this observance a *religious* character. He made it a test of fellowship between him and a beloved apostle. If Peter had continued his refusal to let Jesus wash his (Peter's) feet, he would have cut himself off from fellowship with his Master. "If I wash thee not, thou *hast no part with me.*"

5. An observance commanded. While Christ himself was washing his disciples' feet, they did not understand the nature and the purpose of the practise. Verse 7. But he told them that they should understand it later. Verse 7. So after washing their feet, he asked them, "Know ye what I have done to you?" Do you understand the purpose for which I have washed your feet? Then he proceeds at once to tell them. "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done unto you. . . . If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." In washing your feet, I have given you an example, model, pattern, or copy; and now I enjoin upon you to "wash one another's feet."

6. The benefit to be derived from the observance, is not a literal benefit, but a spiritual blessing. "Happy are ye if ye do them."

The six foregoing facts, when carefully considered, prove beyond question that feet-washing as practised by Christ is a rite, or ordinance, of the new testament. If language is of any use at all, the words of Christ clearly show that feet-washing is a thing to be observed by Christians. The fact that he called it an example proves that he intended it for imitation. It rests upon the same foundation with baptism and the Lord's Supper. All three are established by the precept and the example of the Savior. All three were instituted from elements and practises common to all. From time immemorial it has been the custom of all cleanly people to bathe their bodies frequently in water. In olden times people wore loose garments, and it was necessary to bathe their bodies in water very often. This was usually done by going down into pools or streams and dipping themselves in the water. Now, as far as mode is concerned, there was some similarity between this custom and baptism. But who will say that baptism is simply the perpetuating of this custom? No one. When Jesus instituted Christian baptism, he took the element of water and a practise common to all, and connected his word with them, thus instituting one of the sacred rites of the gospel. In this ordinance these elements are elevated to a place where, in their application, they assume a religious character. The benefits derived and the lessons taught are conducive to our spiritual welfare.

The same is true of the Lord's Supper. It has

been customary, as far as we know, for people of all lands to eat supper. Bread and the fruit of the vine have always been considered common articles of food. In instituting the sacred ordinance of the communion supper, Jesus did not go out of the ordinary. He selected common articles of food. With these he connected his word and established a divine ordinance. Although he selected common articles of food, he elevated the practise above the eating of a common meal. He first broke bread himself and gave to his disciples of the bread and the cup, then commanded them thus: "This do in remembrance of me." What he did was "an observance commanded"—an ordinance. The lesson that it teaches, gives to the observance a *religious* character.

Now, what is true of the two rites mentioned above is also true of feet-washing. Among all people of all nations, in all ages, it has been customary to wash feet for cleanliness. At least this has been the custom of all cleanly people. This was true in ancient times, and it is true yet to-day. As with baptism and the Lord's Supper, Jesus selected something common to all—washing feet with literal water—connected his word with the same, washed his disciples' feet, and then commanded them to "wash one another's feet." Thus he elevated it above the common custom into a religious rite. In the same prepared room and on the same night in which he instituted the communion supper, he washed his disciples' feet and then commanded them to wash one

another's feet. Speaking of both these rites, he said, "Happy are ye if ye do them." Jesus gave to feet-washing a religious character. By his precept and example he exalted it to the place of a religious rite, or ordinance, in the church.

Note carefully the analogy. Christ set before us the ordinance of baptism by both precept and example. He first instituted and practised it himself (John 3:22, 26-30; 4:1.); then he commanded the church to observe it. Matt. 28:19, 20. He did the same with the communion supper. He first instituted and practised it himself (Matt. 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25.); then he commanded the church to observe it. Luke 22:19, 20; 1 Cor. 11:23-26. The same thing is true of feet-washing. He first instituted and practised it himself (John 13:2-7.); then he commanded the church to observe it. John 13:12-16; Matt. 28:20. In baptism Jesus did not invent a mode entirely different from the common custom of the people, nor select an uncommon element. This is also true of the communion and of feet-washing. Literal water is used in two of these rites; the other consists in the eating of bread and the supping of wine. A religious significance is attached to the rite of baptism (see Mark 16:16; 1 Pet. 3:21); likewise to the observance of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:26-29); and the same is true of feet-washing. John 13:8, 9, 16, 17. Feet-washing rests upon the same foundation with baptism and the communion supper. All three are observances com-

manded, established rites of the gospel of Christ. Webster says that an ordinance is “an observance commanded.” Then, feet-washing is an ordinance.

Another thought. Jesus washed his *disciples*’ feet. He did not wash strangers’ feet; nor have we one single hint that previous to this time he was in the habit of washing anybody’s feet. It was not a custom with him, then. The very fact of Peter’s refusal, astonishment, and ignorance of the purpose Christ had in view (verses 6-9), proves that Christ had never done this before. Then, it was not a mere custom with the Savior. Neither did he wash their feet for cleanliness; for that would have been done before entering the house. They had already entered the house and had seated themselves around the table in the very room prepared for the occasion. In this room he broke the communion bread with his disciples and washed their feet. In this room he commanded them to break the bread and also commanded them to wash one another’s feet. These commands were given to his disciples—yes, his *disciples*.

CHRIST INSTITUTED IT.

To institute a practise or a rite is to originate and establish it. There may be some similarity between such rites and common customs of the people as to the elements used and the mode of administering them; but there is no identity, in that established rites are for a different purpose. I affirm that the

feet-washing recorded in the thirteenth chapter of John's Gospel is a new institution. There is positively no identity between it and anything similar ever before practised. In the Old Testament there is frequent mention of people's washing their feet as a custom; but the object was always cleanliness. They washed their own feet before entering the tent or house. The feet-washing mentioned in John 13 was entirely different. There is not a word said about their washing their own feet at the door of the house before entering it. That was the custom. If they had been wearing sandals and their feet had become dirty, cleanliness, according to custom, would have suggested that they wash their feet at the door before entering the prepared room; but the fact is, they had already entered the room which had previously been prepared for the occasion, and had seated themselves at the table.

Here at this very table the last Passover was eaten, and here Jesus instituted the sacred communion supper. In the same room and at the same table where Jesus broke bread with his disciples, he arose "from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do: thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith

unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." Such a thing had never been seen before. No man can cite a similar example anywhere in Jewish custom. Peter, who was well acquainted with Jewish customs, had never seen such a thing before. He was astonished at what Jesus did. The words of Christ to this apostle—"What I do thou knowest not"—proves that when Jesus washed his disciples' feet, he practised neither a Jewish custom nor one of his own. He had never before washed his disciples' feet. It was a new institution.

The only other feet-washing mentioned in the Bible is that recorded in Exod. 30:19-21; 40:31. This was a statute in Israel. The priest had to wash his feet before entering the tabernacle. This was enjoined by positive law of God. It was an ordinance. Aaron and his seed washed feet, not as a mere custom, but as an ordinance that God himself had ordained. So under the old testament there was washing of feet as a common custom of the people, which God did not invent; and there was also an ordinance of feet-washing, which was a statute of the Lord. The ordinance of feet-washing was performed at the door of the Jewish tabernacle, where the priest washed his own feet. But the feet-washing in John 13 was neither the Jewish ordinance nor the Jewish custom. It was performed neither at the door of the Jewish

temple nor at the door of a lodging-house. The disciples did not wash their own feet, nor did Jesus wash his feet, but the Savior washed his disciples' feet. Then he commanded them to "wash one another's feet." Thus, he both originated and established the practise among his disciples; and his doing so makes it a new testament institution.

TIME AND PLACE OF ITS INSTITUTION.

This is a very important point to consider; for it helps us to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the binding obligation to observe this ordinance. If Jesus washed the feet of his disciples at some private house where a common meal was served by a friend, as for instance at the home of Mary and Martha, then his washing their feet is largely robbed of its religious aspect and assumes more the character of an act of hospitality or of a mere lesson of humility. If this were true, it would be difficult to elevate it into a religious ordinance. The reader will see the importance of this point more fully in the next chapter.

Thank God, it is an easy matter to determine the time when, and the place where, Jesus washed his disciples' feet. It was not at the door of a private house nor at the table where a common meal was served. Mark well these facts. The time was the solemn night of his betrayal, the day in which he gave his precious life a ransom for the lost world. The place was a room prepared by the direction of the

Lord himself for a religious meeting, where with his disciples he observed a religious ordinance and held a devotional service. This alone gives to feet-washing, as instituted by Christ, a religious aspect—elevates it from a common custom to a sacred rite of religion.

The day had arrived in which the passover had to be killed. See Matt. 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7. Jesus sent Peter and John to make ready for the Passover. This was done in a large upper room, "furnished." Matt 26:18, 19; Mark 14:13-16; Luke 22:8-13. In the evening, no doubt after night had fallen, Jesus and his disciples entered this room, seated themselves around the table, and began to eat the Passover. Matt. 26:20, 21; Mark 14:17, 18; Luke 22:14-16. Next Jesus arose from the table, laid aside his garments, girded himself with a towel, poured water into a basin, and washed his disciples' feet. John 13:2-5. After this he sat down again at the table and explained to them why he had washed their feet. He set them a model, or pattern, and commanded them to wash one another's feet. He also told them that they would be happy in so doing. John 13:12-17. Then he pointed out Judas, and Judas went out immediately. John 13:21-30. After this he broke the bread and gave them the cup. Luke 22:19, 20. That day was a religious day. That room was furnished and made ready for a religious meeting. This was done by Christ's own direction. It was a meeting of the church—Christ and his disciples.

A religious feast was kept. Now, in that very room, at the same table, Christ both washed his disciples' feet and gave to them the bread and wine. He also enjoined upon them the observance of the communion supper and commanded them to "wash one another's feet."

THE BETHANY-SUPPER THEORY CONSIDERED.

The leading argument brought against foot-washing is that presented by the Disciples, commonly known as Campbellites. There are many others who hold the same opinion. Their belief is this: The foot-washing recorded in John 13 took place in Simon's house in the town of Bethany. Their argument runs as follows:

"The supper at which Jesus washed his disciples' feet was not the Passover supper mentioned by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but took place *'before the feast of the Passover.'* John 13:1. Just two days before the Passover feast (Matt. 26:2) Simon made a supper for Jesus and his disciples, in the town of Bethany. Matt. 26:6-16; Mark 14:3-11. This was the supper at which Jesus washed feet, in the private house of Simon, where a common meal was served. The Savior found the custom of washing feet, for the purpose of cleanliness, in the world when he came. He and his disciples met at Simon's house. Simon did not perform, and none of his servants came to perform, this act of hospitality. Now to

exhibit to his disciples, and to all generations thereafter, an example contrary to anything they had ever seen, the Lord of those disciples, instead of the household servants, performed the act of service. . . . And this, not to elevate the act into a public ordinance, but, by it, to teach them a lesson of humility. . . . Where did he do it? In a private family. When did he do it? Before retiring to rest. Why did he do it? For purposes of cleanliness and comfort. Where was the place? At Bethany, in the house of Simon. At what time? Two days before the feast of the Passover. At this very time—two days before the Passover—Judas went to the high priests to betray Christ. Mark 14:1, 10, 11. This was after Satan had entered into Judas. Luke 22:3-6. And Satan entered Judas after he had received the sop. John 13:27. This locates feet-washing at a private house at Bethany, where a common meal was served, two days before the Passover feast, where Jesus instituted the communion.”

The above was copied from a discussion against feet-washing, by N. A. M’Connel (Disciple minister), of Iowa. It presents their argument in full. I admit that it is the most weighty argument that has yet been brought against the ordinance of feet-washing. It is a very fine-spun and plausible theory, especially to the unenlightened. But the whole argument is falsehood from the ground up. When we carefully dissect it, it falls to pieces. It will not hold together. I will present a number of reasons

which prove the Bethany-supper theory false and at the same time prove that Jesus washed the feet of his disciples at Jerusalem, in the same room where, and at the same time when, the Passover was eaten and the Lord's Supper was instituted.

That Jesus ate a meal in the house of Simon at Bethany, no one will deny. Both Matthew and Mark record the fact. At that supper a woman broke an alabaster box of ointment and poured it upon Jesus' head. This was two days before the Passover feast. But there is no hint of any feet-washing at that table. To say that this supper at the leper's house was the same as that mentioned in John 13 is to manifest ignorance. Let us attend to the evidences in the case.

The leading argument to prove that the supper of John 13 was not the Passover, is based on the language of verse 1—"Now *before* the feast of the Passover."

1. *It does not say that this supper was eaten before the Passover.* Dr. Adam Clark in his commentary says on this verse, "Now before the feast of the Passover, when Jesus knew, or, as some translate, Now Jesus having known before the feast of the Passover, that his hour was come, etc." This is the correct meaning. "Now Jesus knowing before the feast of the Passover, that his hour was come, that he should depart out of the world to the Father," etc.—*Emphatic Diaglott*. The meaning is clear. Before Jesus had eaten the Passover supper with his

disciples, he knew that his hour had come. He knew that this was the last typical Passover to be eaten. He knew that his "hour was come," or that the time had arrived when he himself, the true passover, was to be slain. Mark the fact that his hour *had come* when the supper of John 13 was eaten; that is, the solemn day had arrived when he must be slain and depart out of the world unto the Father. This proves that this supper was the Passover.

2. *It is argued that the Passover was never called a supper.* To this I reply that from usage the Jews did call this very feast a supper. Luke calls the Passover a supper; for he says that the institution of bread and wine was "after supper" (Luke 22:19, 20); and that which they had just eaten was the Passover. See Luke 22:7-16. So John was in perfect harmony with Luke when he called the Passover a supper.

3. *John's Gospel was written at a later date than the other three were, and it was his object to supply what the others had omitted.* The other three accounts are very similar and they cover about the same ground; but from the beginning of John's Gospel to the close its matter is nearly all new. He supplied what the others had omitted. He repeated very little that the other three had written. This accounts for the fact that Matthew, Mark, and Luke mention the Passover and the institution of the Lord's Supper, while John mentions the supper and the institution of feet-washing, but omits the communion.

4. *The supper of John 13 is identified with the Passover supper mentioned by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, by the circumstances connected therewith.* Connected with the supper in Jerusalem, at which the communion was instituted, are several circumstances that are also connected with the supper at which feet-washing was performed by our Savior.

(a) *The pointing out of Judas as the betrayer.*

MATTHEW—"And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born. Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said." Matt. 26:21-25.

MARK—"And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And they began to be sorrowful and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? And he answered and said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish." Mark 14:18-20.

LUKE—"But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me at the table. And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined: but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed! And they began

to enquire among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing.' Luke 22:21-23.

JOHN—"When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked on one another, doubting of whom he spake. Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned unto him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake. He then lying on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, He it is, to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And after the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, That thou doest, do quickly. . . . He then having received the sop went immediately out: and it was night." John 13:21-30.

Who can fail to see the sameness in these accounts? Four evangelists tell the same thing in their own language. You will notice that Judas was made known as the betrayer of Jesus, according to the first three evangelists, at the supper which was eaten at Jerusalem and at which the communion was instituted; while, according to John, Judas was made known at the supper at which Jesus washed the feet of his disciples. This identifies the two suppers as being one and the same. They were not two suppers, but simply different accounts of one and the same supper.

Here is another thought that nails the matter fast. If the supper of John 13 was the Bethany supper, then Jesus informed his disciples twice that one of them would betray him, and twice pointed out Judas. It would involve this difficulty. If Jesus clearly pointed out Judas, as recorded in John 13, at the home of Simon, which would bring the pointing out two days before the Passover, then the apostles had entirely forgotten it when they gathered around the table to eat the Passover. When Jesus broke the news to them at the Passover supper, that one of them should betray him, "they were exceeding sorrowful" and began at once to enquire, "Lord, is it I?" One by one they enquired, "Is it I?" Is it possible that they had entirely forgotten such an important thing in two days? Ah! the very language proves that it was a new announcement to them. To believe the Campbellite Bethany-supper theory is to believe the unnatural, the improbable, the impossible. That theory requires that the disciples, in two days' time, should entirely forget who of their number was to betray their Master and Lord, and thus make a second exposition necessary. This is simply impossible. The supper at which the Savior instituted the communion was the same as that at which he instituted feet-washing.

(b) *The foretelling of Peter's denial.* Immediately following the supper at which Jesus broke bread and gave to his disciples the cup, he foretold Peter's denial. "Peter answered and said unto him, Though

all men should be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended. Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. Peter saith unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee." Matt. 26:33-35. See also Mark 14:29-31; Luke 22:31-34. Now let us turn to John 13, where is recorded the supper at which Christ washed his disciples' feet. Here we find the very same conversation. "Peter saith unto him, Lord, why can not I follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake. Jesus answered him, Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice." Verses 37, 38. "Here we have the same incident. The very same language of Peter and the reply of our Savior are given by the first three evangelists as occurring at the supper at which the communion was instituted, and by John, as occurring at the supper at which Jesus washed his disciples' feet. This identifies the various records as referring to the same supper, and proves that the feet-washing occurred at the same time that the communion was instituted. There is simply no evading this fact."

5. *The feet-washing of John 13 took place at Jerusalem, and not at Bethany.* A careful comparison of the four Gospels will convince the reader that the burden of Matthew, Mark, and Luke was to give the historical account of the life and the ministry of Jesus. They recorded the occurrences and, of course,

some of his teaching. But the burden of John's Gospel was to give the sayings of Christ—to present his teachings on the occasions mentioned by the other evangelists. This is why much of the matter in John's Gospel is new and is not found in the other writings. Matthew, Mark, and Luke record the eating of the last Passover and the instituting of the Lord's Supper; but they record little that Jesus said on the occasion. John records the Passover supper and the institution of feet-washing, and then gives a full account of what the Savior taught them on the solemn occurrence.

After the institution of the Lord's Supper in that upper room in Jerusalem, they "sang a hymn" and "went out into the Mount of Olives." "Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called Gethsemane." Here he prayed until Judas and a multitude came from the chief priests and elders, with swords and staves to take him. See Matt. 26:30-50; Mark 14:26-46; Luke 22:39-54. I advise the reader to read the whole account carefully.

Now we turn to John 13 and read the account of the supper (verses 2-12), of the feet-washing (verses 3-17), of the pointing out of Judas the betrayer (verses 21-26), of Judas' leaving the room immediately and going out to betray Christ (verses 27, 30), and also of the foretelling of Peter's betrayal. Verses 37, 38. After Judas had gone out, Jesus preached to the disciples the comforting sermon recorded in John 14. At the close of this sermon he

said to them, "Arise, let us go hence." Verse 31. The other evangelists tell us that Jesus and his disciples went to the Mount of Olives and came to Gethsemane. On their way there Jesus continued discoursing to his disciples. His words you will find in full in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of John's Gospel. He also stopped along the way and offered the prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter.

"When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into the which he entered, and his disciples. And Judas also, which betrayed him, knew the place; for Jesus oftentimes resorted thither with his disciples. Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons. Jesus therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, stood with them. As soon then as he had said unto them, I am he, they went backward, and fell to the ground. Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he. If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way: that the saying might be fulfilled which he spake, Of them which thou gavest me have I lost none. Then Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high

priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus. Then Jesus said unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? Then the band and the captain and officers of the Jews took Jesus, and bound him, and led him away." Chapter 18: 1-13.

Behold the harmony! Matthew, Mark, and Luke all record the fact that Christ and his disciples went direct from the room where the Lord's Supper had been instituted to the Garden of Gethsemane, where Judas came with the multitude and betrayed the Savior. John records the fact that Christ and his disciples went direct from the room where feet-washing had been instituted, across the brook Cedron, into a garden, where Judas and the multitude found and took Jesus. On this verse Dr. Clark remarks: "Having finished the prayer related in the preceding chapter, our Lord went straight to the Garden of Gethsemane, which was in the Mount of Olives, eastward of Jerusalem. This mount was separated from the city by a very narrow valley, through the midst of which the brook Cedron ran. Cedron is a very small rivulet, about six or seven feet broad." This forever settles the fact that feet-washing was performed in that prepared room in Jerusalem. Bethany is nearly two miles east of Jerusalem. The Mount of Olives lies directly between Bethany and Jerusalem. The brook Kedron, or Cedron, runs between Jerusalem and the Garden of Gethsemane. The

fact that Jesus and his disciples went direct from the room where he had washed their feet, across this brook into the garden, unquestionably proves that the feet-washing of John 13 took place in Jerusalem instead of in Bethany.

Feet-washing as performed by the Savior, rests on a foundation that will stand against all the attacks of human wisdom. Being instituted in the same place, under similar circumstances, with the communion supper—a religious meeting, a meeting held by the Savior's appointment—both these rites are alike enforced by the example and the command of Jesus and are of binding authority as religious ordinances upon followers of Christ everywhere and in all ages of the world.

THE SOLEMNITY SURROUNDING ITS INSTITUTION.

Most of those who oppose feet-washing cry, "Non-essential, non-essential." To this I reply, The solemnity of the night in which Jesus washed his disciples' feet is alone a perfect refutation of this unjust imputation. That night was the most solemn that our Savior ever spent on earth. The mightiest event that ever took place in heaven or upon earth took place on that very day—the death of the world's Redeemer, Jesus the Lord. The last day of Christ's earthly ministry had arrived. He was nearing the solemn hour of death. On that very night the Man of sorrows was betrayed into the hands of sinners.

On that night, under the heavy load of the sins of the whole world, he lay prostrate on the ground. His agony was so great that his sweat was like great drops of blood falling to the ground.

Did Jesus on that awful night have any time to spend on non-essentials? What he there did, was, without doubt, of the most vital importance. What he performed in that prepared room, in that religious gathering, is, of necessity, of great moment. The solemnity of the occasion attaches to his acts and words the greatest significance; and we should regard them with the highest reverence. In the sacredness of that hour Jesus, our humble example, washed his disciples' feet and commanded us to "wash one another's feet."

TO BE OBSERVED IN PUBLIC ASSEMBLY OF SAINTS.

In speaking of widows to be supported by the church, the apostle Paul made the keeping of ordinances one condition. "If she have washed the saints' feet." 1 Tim. 5:10. You will observe, dear reader, that there is a feet-washing which belongs to the "saints." Not a word is said about washing sinners' feet nor about washing strangers' feet, but the requirement was "washing *the saints' feet*." There being a feet-washing peculiar to the saints and practised by the saints, it must have had a beginning somewhere. Every stream has a fountain, a beginning. It is not difficult to find the fountain-head of

this rite peculiar to the saints. We trace it to a room in Jerusalem, where Jesus and his disciples were gathered in a religious meeting. There he washed the saints' feet—the feet of his own disciples—and commanded them—the saints—to “wash one another's feet.”

The question is, Where was this to be performed? Lately, many opposers of the rite admit that Jesus commanded it and that it is all right to observe it; but they say that the place to perform it is in a private house where a brother or a sister needs it for comfort and cleanliness. They say that it belongs to the class of Christian duties with feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and ministering to the wants of the needy saints. To all this I reply: This is simply a blind to evade doing it. You admit that it is a Christian duty and that Christ commanded it, yet you say that it should be performed in the private house. I ask, How many times have you performed this Christian duty? How many times have you washed the saints' feet in a private house? I wonder how many of the preachers of sect Babylon have obeyed Jesus' command—have taken water in a basin, girded themselves with a towel, and performed the Christian duty of washing a disciple's feet in his private home? You would certainly have a hard time to find one. Then, there is one Christian duty and command of Christ which they admit that they never perform nor obey. To keep the whole law and yet offend in one point is to be guilty of all.

But they will answer that a case of necessity has never been presented to them. This would make Christ command them to discharge a Christian duty that they never have any occasion to perform. Surely, people dig pits and fall into them, when they oppose the Word of God. Back in the morning light of the Christian era the saints did wash one another's feet as Jesus commanded; and, thank God, in this evening of time the saints wash one another's feet as Jesus commanded, and that in the public assembly of the saints. The defense we offer for so doing, I will now submit to the reader.

1. There is a feet-washing that was peculiar to, and practised by, "the saints." It did not include sinners nor strangers. This fact makes it a rite of the church of God, for the church is composed of saints.

2. The church is an assembly, or congregation, of saints. Whether two or three or hundreds gather together in his name, they form or constitute a local assembly or church. The practise in the early church of washing "the saints' feet" had its origin in the example and the precept of Jesus Christ himself.

3. The example of Christ establishes the manner and the place of its observance. We have clearly proved in a previous chapter that feet-washing, as instituted by the Savior, is an ordinance of the church. Ordinances of the church should be observed in the assemblies of the saints, at the places where they gather together for worship.

4. Jesus did not wash his disciples' feet singly, at different times, in some private house, or in their own houses, as a mere act of necessity; nor did he perform the act at the door of a private house for the purpose of cleanliness.

5. When Jesus washed his disciples' feet, they were gathered together in an assembly. They were a congregation of saints that had met together for religious worship. This meeting was by appointment. Now, Jesus said, "I have given you *an example*, that ye should do *as I have done*." Do we not follow his example, then, when we wash one another's feet in the assembly of the saints met for religious worship?

6. In the room and at the same meeting where Jesus washed his disciples' feet a discourse was given, and they sang a hymn. We do likewise.

7. Jesus washed feet in the same room, at the same time, that he broke bread and gave the cup. So do we.

8. He washed feet before communion. We do also.

9. He did not in this ordinance wash feet at some private house as a mere hospitable act. Neither do we.

10. Nor did he wash feet at the door of some house for cleanliness. Nor do we.

11. As practised in the apostles' days, it was a washing "of the saints' feet." It is the same as we practise it to-day.

12. Finally, we show the positive form in which it was given. It was enjoined upon the disciples in the same company that received the communion, in the very same place, and at the very same time, in

Jerusalem. What more could we have? What more could there be to establish an ordinance in the church? Christ brought the communion and feet-washing together in that assembly of the apostles, in that religious meeting. Then, let them stand together. Let the Lord's Supper and feet-washing stand hand in hand, together, where Jesus left them.

THE RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF FEET-WASHING.

This is clearly seen in all the foregoing facts and truths, which I need not repeat. Its being connected with a religious service gives to it a religious bearing. I call the reader's attention to the words of Christ to Peter: "Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Verses 6-8. How vain to imagine that the Lord Jesus would have made some old custom a test of fellowship between him and a beloved disciple, who had left all to follow him and had followed him during three and one-half years! Yet he said to Peter, when he refused to let the Master wash his feet, "If I wash thee not, *thou hast no part with me.*" You see, had Peter continued his refusal to take part in that feet washing, his persistence would have cut him off from union with

Christ. It is wholly unreasonable and utterly nonsensical to say that this was but the old custom for mere cleanliness. The refusal to take part in a mere custom, a custom having no connection with religion, would cut no one off from spiritual fellowship with the Savior. This is positive proof that the feet-washing practised by Christ was a religious rite then being instituted; and to refuse to observe it is to be a commandment-breaker, a violator of the law of Christ, and hence to be guilty of sin. If Peter's refusal to take part in feet-washing would have cut him off from the Master, then the refusal of professors to-day will produce the same affect.

The profit to be derived from washing one another's feet as Jesus commanded is not a literal benefit, but a spiritual blessing. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." Verse 17. Two ordinances were instituted on the same night—feet-washing and the Lord's Supper. Of them Jesus said, "*Happy are ye if ye do them.*" "*Blessed are ye if ye do them.*"—*Revised Version*. No one will for a moment doubt that Jesus included feet-washing in the phrase "these things." He meant the ordinances and the precepts which he on that night delivered to his disciples. Note the effect of doing them: 'Ye shall be happy, yea, blessed.' "A doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing."—*Revised Version*, Jas. 1:25. Time and again we have proved the words of Christ to be true. As we have humbly taken our place at the feet of our

brethren and in obedience to Jesus' command have washed their feet, our soul has been refreshed with Heaven's richest blessings.

DELIVERED TO THE CHURCHES BY THE APOSTLES.

By both precept and example Christ enjoined upon his disciples the observance of the rite of feet-washing. He commanded them to wash one another's feet. Then when he gave them the last great commission to make disciples among all nations, a charge binding to the end of the world, he said, "Teaching them to *observe all things* whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. 28:20. I maintain that the commission includes baptism, the Lord's Supper, and feet-washing. The first of these is clearly mentioned; the last two are clearly implied. The apostles were to teach the converts to Christianity from among all nations to observe all that Christ had taught them; and as Christ had taught them feet-washing, they were commanded to teach all nations to observe feet-washing. The observance of all things that Jesus commanded includes feet-washing. This makes it obligatory upon the ministers to preach it and upon all saints to observe it. No one will question whether the apostles were faithful to the charge committed to them. They fulfilled the commission and hence preached feet-washing, together with all the other precepts of the

Savior. They preached everywhere the gospel of Christ. That gospel contains feet-washing, by both the example and the command of Jesus. You will find it written out in full in the gospel of John, chapter 13, verses 3-17. The apostles spoke to the people "all the words of this life." Acts 5:20. By this is meant the whole gospel. This, of course, included feet-washing, which is a part of the gospel.

Paul says, "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Acts 29:27. To counsel means to advise, admonish, or instruct. Now, all reasonable people will admit that Jesus advised, or instructed, his disciples to wash one another's feet. The man who will not admit this is too ignorant or too stubborn to serve God. Feet-washing is a part of the counsel of God. Since Paul declared the *whole counsel of God*, he preached to the people the necessity of observing this ordinance. This is how it comes that Timothy and the saints under his charge knew all about feet-washing, and the widows with all the rest practised it. See 1 Tim. 5:10. When Paul wrote to Timothy, the widows already knew all about this rite and had been observing the washing "of the saints' feet." How did Timothy's congregations learn to wash one another's feet? Answer. The truth is: Paul, Timothy, and all the other disciples had taught it with the rest of the gospel message, and Timothy and his congregations had been practising it as the Lord had taught them; therefore it was understood between Paul and Timothy before

Paul wrote to him. You see, no explanation was needed in Paul's letter to Timothy. Paul did not need to explain what he meant by the expression "have washed the saints' feet." It was well-known, being preached everywhere.

Paul further says, "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you." Acts 20:20. He preached foot-washing; for it is one of the profitable things that we are commanded to do. It is one of the things which, if we do, we shall be happy and blessed. These things he taught from house to house and publicly.

One more thought. Feet-washing as instituted and commanded by Christ is of the new testament. It is just as much a part of the new covenant as the Lord's Supper is. Both stand together. The new testament was ratified and sealed by the precious blood of Christ. It was thus made of force to you and me. That blood of the new covenant makes its teachings very binding upon us. Its precepts were delivered to us by the apostles' inspiration and writings; and they clearly inform us that the things which they wrote "are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14:37.

HISTORICAL PROOF.

We do not rely upon the testimony of history, by any means, in order to prove that the primitive churches practised foot-washing. If there were not

a word in history about it, that would not change the teaching of Christ. All the ordinances were badly corrupted at a very early date. The manner and the design of their administration were changed almost immediately after the death of the apostles. So history can not be entirely relied on. Yet we can learn whether certain rites were still observed in those times. We have sufficient testimony in history to warrant the belief that feet-washing was observed by the Christians for a considerable time after the death of the first apostles.

“The ancient rites of baptism are almost all in use at this day, but many are not now in connection with the baptism. The washing of feet is in the Greek and Roman and some Protestant churches. The ancient baptismal kiss went along with Easter Sunday, and the Greek church and some Protestant churches continued it, not at baptism, but the Greeks at Easter and the Protestants after the Lord’s Supper.”—*Robison’s History of Baptism*, page 331. This Baptist historian says that the Greek church, for a time at least, held to the rite of feet-washing, and also that some Protestants continued its practise.

Now I will quote from Bingham, page 561. He quotes Austin. “In the other Epistle he speaks particularly of washing feet, but that was after baptism, on the third day of the octaves, or such other time as those churches which retained the ceremony saw fit to appoint.” Notice that this language implies that feet-washing was a ceremony, or rite, of the

church and that it was observed in their assemblies at certain appointed times.

The same historian further says: "Among the churches which never received this custom we may reckon the Roman church; and among those which always received it, the church at Milan. But they of the Roman church pleaded that it was not to be done by way of mystery in baptism or regeneration, but only by way of humility, as the custom of washing the feet of strangers. But, on the contrary, the church of Milan pleaded that it was not merely a business of humility, but of mystery and sanctification, because Christ said to Peter, 'Except I wash thy feet thou hast no part with me.' "

Again I quote from the same author, page 562: "And others who retain it, that they might recommend it by fixing it to some more sacred time, and yet distinguish it from the sacrament of baptism, choose either the third day of the octaves, or the octave after baptism itself, as most convenient for this purpose. Among the churches which wholly refused or abrogated this custom, the Spanish church is one, which, in the council of Eliberis, made a canon against it." Here we have the time when and the place where the Church of Rome abolished foot-washing.

We will now go back to the early writers and show that they mention it as being observed in their day. The following is from "Ordinances of the New Testament" by Wm. G. Schell:

“Tertullian, who wrote near the close of the second century, speaks of feet-washing as though it were a common practise among the saints of his time. ‘Tertullian urges it as one strong objection to the marriage of a Christian woman with an unbeliever, that she could . . . not wash the feet of the saints, nor offer to them either food or drink; but must, if she would honor them, conceal them in the house of another, because of her husband’s unwillingness to gratify her in this particular.’—*Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, by Lyman Coleman.

“Like the apostle Paul, Tertullian classes feet-washing with the regular duties of Christians. He brings forth nowhere in his extensive writings any arguments to substantiate the ordinance of feet-washing. Is this not a proof that down to his times this ordinance was never impugned? If feet-washing were not in his day a common practise, to make it, as he does, a Christian duty, would have called for at least some argument to establish its orthodoxy. As nothing of the kind is employed, could we but conclude that all understood it to be a regular Christian duty? which could have been so looked upon, only by its being in actual practise among the Christians of that day.

“We will next call the reader’s attention to the writings of Chrysostom and Augustine.

“CHRYSTOSTOM.

“*Homily on St. John, No. 71, which is but a comment on the thirteenth chapter of John.*

“ ‘Ver. 14, 15. “If I then,” he saith, “your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another’s feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.”

“ ‘And yet it is not the same thing, for he is Lord and Master, but ye are fellow servants one of another. What meaneth then the “as”? “With the same zeal.” For on this account he taketh instances from greater actions that we may, if so be, perform the less. Thus schoolmasters write the letters for children very beautifully, that they may come to imitate them, though but in an inferior manner. Where now are they who spit on their fellow servants? where now they who demand honors? Christ washed the feet of the traitor, the sacrilegious, the thief, and that close to the time of the betrayal, and incurable as he was, made him a partaker of his table; and art thou high-minded, and dost thou draw up thine eyebrows? “Let us then wash one another’s feet,” saith some; “then we must wash those of our domestics.” And what great thing if we do wash even those of our domestics? In our case “slave” and “free” is a difference of words; but there, an actual reality. For by nature he was Lord and we servants, yet even he refused not at this time to do. But now it is matter for contentment if we do not treat free men as bondmen, as slaves bought with money. And what shall we say in that day, if after receiving proofs of such forbearance, we ourselves do not imitate them at all, but take the contrary part, being

in diametrical opposition, lifted up, and not discharging the debt? For God hath made us debtors one to another, having first so done himself, and hath made us debtors of a less amount. For he was our Lord, but we do it, if we do it at all, to our fellow servants, a thing which he himself implied by saying, "If I then your Lord and Master—so also do ye." It would indeed naturally have followed to say, "How much more should ye servants," but he left this to the conscience of the hearers.

"'. . . And he mentioned not the greater action, that "if I have washed the feet of the traitor, what great matter if ye wash one another's?" but having exemplified this by deed, he then left it to the judgment of the spectators. Therefore he said, "Whosoever shall do and teach, the same shall be called great" (Matt. 5:19); for this is "to teach" a thing, actually to do it. . . .

"'Ver. 16-18. "Verily I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his Lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them. I speak not of you all—but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me."

"'What he said before, this he saith here also, to shame them; "For if the servant is not greater than his master, nor he that is sent greater than he that sent him, and these things have been done by me, much more ought they to be done by you." Then.

lest any one should say, "Why now sayest thou these things? Do we not already know them?" He addeth this very thing, "I speak not to you as not knowing, but that by your actions ye may show forth the things spoken of." For "to know," belongeth to all; but "to do," not to all. On this account he said, "Blessed are ye if ye do them"; and on this account I continually and ever say the same to you, although ye know it, that I may set you on the work. Since even Jews "know," but yet they are not "blessed"; for they do not what they know.'

"AUGUSTINE.

"Comment on John 13:14. Homily 58.

" " "If I then," he says, "your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." This, blessed Peter, is what thou didst not know when thou wert not allowing it to be done. This is what he promised to let thee know afterwards, when thy Master and thy Lord terrified thee into submission, and washed thy feet. We have learned, brethren, humility from the Highest; let us, as humble, do to one another what he, the Highest, did in his humility. Great is the commendation we have here of humility: and brethren do this to one another in turn, even in the visible act itself, when they treat one another with hospitality; for the practise of such humility is generally prevalent, and finds expression in the

very deed that makes it discernible. And hence the apostle, when he would commend the well-deserving widow, says, "If she is hospitable, if she has washed the saints' feet." And wherever such is not the practise among the saints, what they do not with the hand they do in heart, if they are of the number of those who are addressed in the hymn of the three blessed men, "O ye holy and humble of heart, bless ye the Lord." But it is far better, and beyond all dispute more accordant with the truth, that it should also be done with the hands; nor should the Christian think it beneath him to do what was done by Christ. For when the body is bent at a brother's feet, the feeling of such humility is either awakened in the heart itself, or is strengthened if already present.'

"Such sentiments as the foregoing, from Chrysostom and Augustine, two of the brightest lights of the fourth century, are proof that feet-washing was practised in the church down to their times; for it can not be that such brained expositors of the Word of God would have penned such words if they did not express the orthodox sentiments of their day.

"Neither could they have occupied the place among the Fathers as orthodox writers, which they have ever occupied, had they indulged in the wild fancies they evidently indulged in, were the ordinance of feet-washing not taught and practised by the church of their day.

"Surely there were more Christians than Chrysostom and Augustine in the fourth century who prac-

tised feet-washing. And if we say they did not practise it, we make them of the class who 'say, and do not.'

"But we need not conjecture, since Augustine declares in the above concerning the visible act of feet-washing, in his day, 'The practice of such humility is generally prevalent.' So anti-feet-washers not only make Augustine a hypocrite by saying he did not practise feet-washing, but make him a liar when they say it was not generally practised by the church in his day."

WHY NOT MORE FREQUENTLY MENTIONED? ANSWERED.

One objection brought up by the opposers of this ordinance is that it is not frequently mentioned in the New Testament. They say that if it had been practised by the primitive church, the fact would have been mentioned repeatedly. To this I reply: It was not necessary to have God's word continually repeated after the Savior had spoken it. His command, once given, is just as binding on us as if he had repeated it a hundred times. While there are not many places in the Scriptures where it is found or mentioned, I urge that it is found in the *language*, the *precept*, and the *example* of the Son of God. That is enough. That Matthew, Mark, and Luke do not mention Christ's conversation with Nicodemus and His declaration, "Ye must be born again," does not detract

one iota from its significance. The same is true of a hundred other things recorded by John but not found in the other Gospels. Again, if feet-washing had never been mentioned in any of the writings of the apostles, this would not be any evidence against it nor any proof that it was not an ordinance. But it is mentioned, and that fact adds evidence that it was practised.

The communion supper is but once clearly mentioned in the book of Acts—in the seventh verse of the twentieth chapter. It is also mentioned in the first Corinthian letter. But no mention is made of it in Romans, Second Corinthians, Galatians Ephesians, Philippians, Collossians, First Thessalonians, Second Thessalonians, First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, James, First Peter, Second Peter, First John, Second John, Third John. In none of these books is the rite of the Lord's Supper named. Does that prove that the early church did not observe it? I think not. It is mentioned in two books of the writings of the apostles; namely, Acts and First Corinthians. So is feet-washing mentioned in two books of the apostles' writings. It is included in 1 Cor. 11:2 and is clearly named in 1 Tim. 5:10.

The solution of the whole matter is this: The apostles first went and preached the gospel to the people, and when they believed, they were baptized. The apostles also delivered all the ordinances to the believers to observe. Now, in writing to them, it was

unnecessary to mention any of the ordinances, only as the people had some of them wrong or had raised a dispute over them. Of course, if any of them were directly connected with the subject upon which the apostles were writing, it was necessary to mention that one. When the apostle commended the church at Corinth for keeping the ordinances as he had delivered them, it was necessary to specify or name only the one they were disputing over and had gotten wrong. That is why Paul mentions the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 11. It was the ordinance that they were not keeping in a proper manner. Therefore it was necessary for him to set the matter right. If they had become confused in the manner of observing the rite of feet-washing, Paul would have mentioned that too; but as they were keeping this rite just as Jesus instructed, it was unnecessary for him to mention it. Yet he did include it in verse 2, when he praised them for keeping the "ordinances." The fact that Paul in his letter to Timothy, specified and named the washing of "the saints' feet" thirty-two years after it had been instituted by our Lord, is clear proof and shows positively that it had not been dead all these years, but had been observed by the saints.

WHAT IT TEACHES.

Like baptism and the communion, feet-washing was instituted for a purpose. It teaches us some impor-

tant lessons. Its object is made clear by the words of Jesus, as follows: "So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."

1. *A lesson of humility.* Christ, our Lord and Master, humbled himself and washed his disciples' feet. Oh, what an example of humility! The Lord of glory, the Creator of the universe, he whom all the angels worship, he before whom every knee shall bow, girded himself with a towel, poured water into a basin, and washed his disciples' feet. This is intended to rebuke for all time the haughty spirit of man. Only those can be followers of this Jesus, who are meek and lowly. Those proud professors who scoff and jeer at feet-washing are not fit to bear the name Christian; nor will Christ for a moment own them. No child of God will for a moment make light of, or refuse to do, what Jesus was humble enough to do. Hear the words of Christ again: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one

another's feet." Yes, and we will. We will humble ourselves before our brethren, and wash one another's feet, according to his example.

2. *Our position in the church.* Jesus took his place at the feet of the disciples. He thus gave us an example to teach us our place among the brethren. In the church of God there are no big *I's* and little *you's*, as is the case in sect-Babylon, but "one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren"—just *brethren*. In this humble ordinance we show our place among the brethren—at their feet. As long as the saints feel in their hearts as Paul did—that they are "less than the least of all saints"—it will not be grievous to take their place at the feet of the brethren. In sectism everybody is scrambling and climbing to reach the highest place and receive the most honor. In the church of God we "mind not high things," but "esteem others better than ourselves." We recognize the fact that our place is at the feet of the brethren. In reality, we all belong there. In the humble rite of feet-washing we give public testimony to this fact.

3. *We are servants to each other.* When instituting this rite, Jesus said, "I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." "The servant is not greater than his lord." Jesus took the place of a servant among the brethren. He served them; he washed their feet. Now "let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." He "took upon him the form of a servant." Phil.

2:5, 7. So we "in love, serve one another." Gal. 5:13. Paul says, "I made myself servant unto all." In the rite of feet-washing we show forth the fact that we are servants to our brethren. "I am among my brethren as one that serveth."

4. *We honor Christ.* There are scarcely any who would not be glad to wash Jesus' feet if they had the opportunity. Thank God, we can, and we do. He says, "As ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Every time we wash our brethren's feet, we wash Jesus' feet. No wonder Christ said we should be "happy" in the observance of this ordinance.

"WASH ONE ANOTHER'S FEET."

Humility, O sweetest grace
 E'er unto mortals given,
 Didst ever thou in all the earth
 Or ever up in heaven
 Expression find in any act
 So grand as at the time
 When Jesus washed his servants' feet?
 How humble! how sublime!

The King above all other kings,
 Before whom angels fall,
 The Maker of the universe,
 The Ruler over all—
 The Master washed the servants' feet,
 Thus by example taught
 That we should wash each other's feet,
 And plainly said, "Ye ought."

Oh, is there now in all the earth
 A scene so passing fair
 As when the faithful of the Lord
 To "upper room" repair,

Where Peace and Joy from round the throne
Come down our souls to greet
While gladly there we honor Him—
“Wash one another’s feet.”

O mortal man on earth below,
Why will you be so proud,
When soon, alas! your all may be
A coffin and a shroud?
Why not obey the Savior’s words
And humble thus your heart?
For if, like Peter, you refuse
With Him you’ll have no part.

How blest indeed it is to fill
The servant’s lowly place,
To ever do our Master’s will
And see his smiling face!
Oh, let us ev’ry word observe,
For his commands are sweet;
And one of them is simply this—
“Wash one another’s feet.”

—EVA E. ANDREWS.

THE SUBSTITUTION THEORY REFUTED.

Dr. Godbey, who is a prominent figure in the modern sect-holiness movement, says that “Christ never intended us to literally wash one another’s feet, because at the very time that he was literally washing Peter’s feet, he said to him, ‘What I do thou knowest not now, but shalt know hereafter.’ Peter knew that Jesus was washing his feet with his literal hands and with literal water, yet he knew not what Jesus did. After the fiery baptism at Pentecost, Peter then understood the spiritual lesson Jesus had taught.”

Now, this Babylon theology may pass in the dark

realms of sectism, but to the "saints in light" its dishonesty and deception are evident. True, Peter did not understand just what Jesus intended by washing their feet in that prepared room at that religious gathering; but we are happy to say that he did not need to wait until the fiery baptism of Pentecost to find out. He and all the other disciples clearly understood what Jesus had done, before they left the room. Christ himself plainly told them. And he did not tell them that he had simply exemplified some spiritual lesson before them. Here are his own words of explanation: "Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." Christ's own words of explanation are a perfect refutation of Mr. Godbey's theory. After washing their feet he said to them, "I have given you an example," and then he commanded them to "wash one another's feet." You see, the ordinance of feet-washing, like the Lord's Supper, will not admit of spiritualizing, for it was literally instituted by the Savior.

But it is argued that to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick, etc., is the same as to wash their feet. It might with just as much consistency be said that these things would take the place of the communion. Feed them bread when hungry, instead of taking a small bit yourself. Most professors

would revolt at this; yet when it comes to the humble rite of feet-washing, they will contend for substitution.

The doctrine of substitution has no place in the Bible. Christ meant what he said and said what he meant. He did not say, "If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought to clothe the naked, feed the hungry, visit the sick," etc. These Christian duties are all enjoined elsewhere. What, then, did he command us to do? These are his own words: "*Wash one another's feet.*" "Now, from the language of Jesus under consideration, it is evident that the disciples not only were to deduce a certain moral lesson from this act of Christ's, but were actually to wash one another's feet. 'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.' To what things did Jesus refer? Feet-washing was certainly one. 'These' always refers to the things last mentioned, or near by. Jesus had just washed their feet—it was the last thing he had done. Then, it must have been one of the things he referred to. 'If ye do them.' Do what? Wash one another's feet. Then, there was to be an actual observance of the thing—that is, of washing one another's feet. The Savior did not say, 'Ye must be humble enough to be *willing* to wash one another's feet'; neither can his language be construed to mean that. Nor did he say, 'Ye must be willing and ready to perform any act of kindness for one another.' But he said, 'If ye know *these things*, happy are ye *if ye do them.*' Connect this with the language of Christ, 'I have given you an example, that

ye should do as I have done to you,' and the disciples could not possibly have understood anything else than that they were to wash one another's feet."

"You might black boots or wash clothes for ages; sit by the bedside of your sick and dying brother for weeks and months, and minister to his needs in numberless ways, as circumstances might require; and yet you have not followed Christ's example, nor obeyed his command, which was, in plain word and deed, to *wash one another's feet*. There was a specific act that he performed and commanded; and in the performance of that specific act only can his disciples follow his example and fulfil his command."

OLD CUSTOM CONSIDERED.

About all opposers of feet-washing refer the people to the common custom of washing feet for cleanliness. They take great pains to show that the Jews had this custom and then declare that because they wore sandals it was necessary. This, dear reader, is all for effect. I very much doubt if any of them really believe that the feet-washing Jesus performed in that room in Jerusalem was the same as the old Jewish custom. This reference to the common custom of washing feet is simply to draw the people's attention away from the sacred rite which Jesus instituted.

The old "sandal" theory originated in Babylon and became thread-bare long ago; yet it is repeated over and over again. It would be just as consistent

to assail the Lord's Supper on the ground that it was an old custom to eat supper; that bread and the fruit of the vine have always been common articles of food; and that, therefore, what Jesus did was only to follow the old custom of eating supper. The fact is, the old custom of washing feet for cleanliness has no more to do with the feet-washing performed and commanded by the Savior on the solemn night of his betrayal than the old custom of bathing for cleanliness has to do with baptism or the old custom of eating supper has to do with the sacred Lord's Supper. I will submit a number of facts which clearly prove that there is no identity between the custom of washing feet and the ordinance of feet-washing.

1. *The old custom is still the custom.* By having their attention called away from the ordinance that Jesus instituted, as recorded in John 13, and its true character, back to the ancient custom of washing feet, the people are more easily duped. Thus, false teachers speak of it as a thing of the past—a thing that passed away with the wearing of sandals, which belonged only to Eastern and ancient people. Now, the real truth is, all cleanly people of all nations, ancient and modern, Eastern and Western, sandal-wearers, and shoe-wearers, have washed, and do wash, their feet for cleanliness. It is a universal custom.

2. *The feet-washing of John 13 was not this custom.* Is it not strange that if this was the common custom, Christ had not been in the habit of doing it before? During his entire ministry, which covered

a period of three and one-half years, he had never before washed his disciples' feet. This is clearly proved by the fact that Peter had never seen such a thing and knew nothing about it. So, you see, that despite the assertions of modern teachers to the contrary, it was not a common custom.

3. *The manner of the ancient custom.* For the benefit of the reader I will quote the scriptures where the ancient custom is mentioned. "Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree." Gen. 18:4. "And he said, Behold now, my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house, and tarry all night, and wash your feet, and ye shall rise up early, and go on your ways." Gen. 19:2. "And the man came into the house: and he ungirded his camels, and gave straw and provender for the camels, and water to wash his feet, and the men's feet that were with him." Gen. 24:32. "And the man brought the men into Joseph's house, and gave them water, and they washed their feet; and he gave their asses provender." Gen. 43: 24. "So he brought him into his house, and gave provender unto the asses: and they washed their feet, and did eat and drink." Judges 19:21. "And David said to Uriah, Go down to thy house, and wash thy feet. And Uriah departed out of the king's house, and there followed him a mess of meat from the king." 2 Sam. 11:8. "And when the servants of David were come to Abigail to Carmel, they spake unto her, saying, David sent us unto thee, to take thee

to him to wife. And she arose, and bowed herself on her face to the earth, and said, Behold, let thine handmaid be a servant to wash the feet of the servants of my lord." 1 Sam. 25:40, 41.

You will observe that in practising the custom each one washed his own feet. Only one exception to this rule is mentioned—the case of Abigail, who offered to wash the feet of the servants of David. Any one can see at a glance that the object was comfort and cleanliness. Now, I affirm in the fear of God that the feet-washing mentioned in John 13 is not this custom, but differs from it both in manner and in design.

4. *Feet-washing under a new aspect.* In the cases referred to above water was brought, and the guests washed their own feet, or in one case the servant of the house offered to do it. Now, in the case of the feet-washing of Jesus, it was neither of these. 'The disciples were to wash *one another's* feet. It was neither the least among them that was to wash the feet of the others, nor the greatest. Among them there was to be no least and no greatest. This fact of indiscriminate service presents feet-washing to us under a new aspect.' Christ did not say to his disciples, "When you get homes of your own and get all domestic affairs well-settled about you, and some of your saved brethren come along and remain with you over night, you must wash their feet for their comfort and cleanliness." Nor did he say, "The least of you must perform this service," nor "he that is

greatest.” This is not the manner in which Christ gave the commandment. Without waiting to dispute as to who is greatest or who is least, we are to wash one another’s feet; for we are all alike, all brethren together, all members of one spiritual family—the family of the Lord, who set us this beautiful example.

5. *The custom and the ordinance contrasted.* “While this custom is not practised as extensively as it was in ancient days, in many respects it is the same now as then. The design is the same—cleanliness—and the ancient people practised this custom in the same way that modern people do; that is, each one washed his own feet. Gen. 18:14. 19:2; 24:32; 43:24. So in that particular the custom has never changed; but ancient and modern, Eastern and Western, people, those who wore sandals or shoes and stockings, or those who went or go with bare feet, that is, all decent people of every age or nation that we know of, washed, and do wash, their feet when necessary for cleanliness or comfort. Any Christian, sinner, or heathen will wash the feet of those who are not able to wash themselves. And thus the custom of washing feet has existed from time immemorial and is still going on in the world among saints, sinners, and heathen also, and will go on as long as there is a cleanly people on earth. This custom, however, is separate from any ordinance, and belongs to all people. But while this is true of this custom, we still see the ordinance of feet-washing, instituted by the Lord and recorded in St. John 13, practised

in the church of God as our Lord commanded (verse 14, 15,) and as St. Paul demanded. 1 Tim. 5:10. The saints still wash each other's feet according to the Lord's example and teaching. And God is still fulfilling the promise that Jesus made to us. Hence we see that the custom of washing feet and the ordinance of feet-washing are two different things, as we will more clearly prove hereafter—different in manner, practise, and design."

In the custom, each one washes his own feet; in the ordinance, we are commanded to wash one another's feet. A difference in manner. In the custom, the design is cleanliness and comfort; in the ordinance (as seen in a previous chapter), the design is to impress some spiritual lessons, to publicly testify to certain blessed truths. A difference in design. The benefit received from the custom is a literal benefit—cleanliness; the benefit received from the observance of the ordinance is a spiritual benefit. "If ye know these things, *happy are ye if ye do them.*" A difference in the benefit received. People wash feet as a custom, simply out of necessity. Propriety suggests it. But in the ordinance, we wash one another's feet because Jesus, our Lord, set the example and commanded us to follow it. Modern people wash their feet as a custom of cleanliness. None of them claim that they do it in obedience to the instructions that Jesus gave in the thirteenth chapter of John. There is a vast difference, you see. The custom is practised by Christians, Mohammedans, infidels, sinners,

and heathens; the ordinance is observed only by "saints." 1 Tim. 5:10. The two can not be the same.

6. *Positive argument that there is no identity between the custom and the ordinance.* The Savior washed the disciples' feet. He did not wash his own, and they did not wash his. If it had been a mere matter of dirty feet, would not Christ have needed the washing as well as they? Although he had walked with them all day, not a word is said about his own feet. You see, he was there instituting a new rite for the church. "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet." There is no proof that they were wearing sandals at this time. It was rather a cold time to go bare-footed. On that very night Peter went to the fire and "warmed himself." John 16:25. The people wore shoes as well as sandals.

Another thought worthy of note is this: it was the custom to bathe immediately before eating the Pass-over. No doubt Jesus and his disciples had bathed before entering that prepared room. If there was any washing feet for cleanliness, it was done on entering the room or before entering it. Jesus very clearly showed the disciples that the object of his washing their feet was not cleanliness "He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean." Verse 10, Revised Version. The words "save" and "his feet" are not to be found in ancient authorities; they are omitted. The

words Jesus spoke were these: "He that is bathed needeth not to wash, but is clean every whit: and *ye are clean.*" They were "every whit" clean. That means feet and all. If he had washed them for cleanliness, he would have included their hands and their heads, as Peter suggested; but they had been to the bath and were "*every whit*" clean. He was washing for a different purpose. He was instituting a Christian rite, the rite of feet-washing; hence it was not necessary to wash them, 'save their feet.'

Peter was a Jew and he was well acquainted with Jewish customs and ordinances; but he was astonished at what Jesus was doing. He had never seen the like before. That proves conclusively that what the Lord did was not a Jewish custom. Again, Jesus said to him, "What I do, thou knowest not now." He knew the Jewish custom well enough, but he knew nothing of the feet-washing that Jesus was there performing. So it was not the custom.

There is a penalty attached to the refusal or neglect of the feet-washing that Jesus performed and commanded. When Peter said, "Thou shalt never wash my feet," Jesus replied, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Here was one who refused to take any part in the feet-washing in the assembly of the saints. He was unwilling that Christ should wash his feet. But the Master gave him to understand that if he would not submit and take part, he would be cut off from his (Christ's) union and fellowship. "Thou hast no part with me." It meant

separation. Such is the penalty. It means thus much yet to-day. It means just as much to you, dear friend, as it meant to Peter. But when we come to old universal customs, there is never any penalty attached for their non-observance. Jesus would not for a moment make some old Jewish rite a test of fellowship between him and a beloved disciple. This adds another strong proof in favor of feet-washing as an ordinance of the new testament.



GOOD WORKS.

I now come to the leading objection raised against feet-washing; namely, that it is not an ordinance of the church, but a good work in the private home, classed with rearing children, lodging strangers, relieving the afflicted, etc.—all personal and private deeds. 1 Tim. 5:10. The trouble with those who contend that it is a good work, and not an ordinance, is that they never perform it. It would be hard indeed to find a widow or any one else among these opposers, who would meet every requirement mentioned in 1 Tim. 5:10. Remember that one requirement was, “If she have washed the saints’ feet.” Is it possible that this was something that widows alone were required to do? Did the apostles enjoin it upon the widow, and not upon the rest of the church? Do you suppose that she was under obligation to obey it, and nobody else? The truth is that Paul and all the rest of the saints practised it. for it was enjoined

upon all; and this was done upon no other principle than that which the Savior has commanded us to obey.

Saints are commanded by Christ to wash one another's feet. "Here is where the Savior and Paul, in that letter concerning the widow, come together. A religious rite is certainly found in a ceremony, when the rite is to be performed by one saint upon another. No new testament command or duty that God has ever enjoined his disciples to observe with one another has ever been abolished. Commands like these: Exhort one another, pray for one another, love one another—these are forms of a command. They command the disciples in reference to things they shall do to one another, just like feet-washing. That brings them together as a company with one faith, one mind, in one body, separate from the world, and gives them a rite or ceremony that they are to perform one upon another. Many duties are to be performed to the world, as feeding the hungry, entertaining strangers, etc. But the observance of the command to be done by one saint to another has all the essentials of an ordinance, and if such a command is to be observed when they are assembled together, it is made a church ordinance. No duty, command, or observance that Christ ever enjoined to be done by one saint to another, mark you, has ever been abolished by divine authority. And if Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith on this subject of feet-washing, it will lead us to obey his

word, unless our opinions turn us to follow some other leader.”

“Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints’ feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work.” 1 Tim. 5:9, 10. Here we have feet-washing separate from the lodging of strangers; the lodging of strangers is referred to as one thing and the washing of feet as another thing. Now, if feet-washing were to have been regarded merely as an act of hospitality, no distinction would have been made between strangers and saints. Note well the fact that there is in this scripture no obligation to wash the feet of anybody on earth except the saints. Saints are to wash the feet of saints. Is that not exactly what Jesus commanded when he instituted the rite as recorded in John 13? Thus, we have a ceremony, institution, or rite, twice named in the gospel, and enjoined by divine authority upon the “saints”—something that they shall observe one with another—and no one outside of the church is referred to.

Let us examine more closely. Here are the qualifications that the apostle demanded: “Having been the wife of one husband.” Not a word is said about washing her husband’s feet. “If she have brought up children.” There is not a word about washing her children’s feet. “If she have lodged strangers.”

Not one word is said about washing the strangers' feet. "If she have relieved the afflicted." Nothing is said about washing the feet of the afflicted. Note well this point. If she had washed the feet of her husband, of her children, of the strangers that she lodged, or of the afflicted that she ministered to, then the feet-washing that Paul mentioned would have belonged to mere acts of hospitality, would have been a mere performance in the private home. That was not the requirement. The apostle makes a clear distinction between these family duties and the sacred ordinance that Jesus instituted. "*If she have washed the saints' feet.*" Whose feet? "*The saints'.*" This observance separates it from the entertainment and the lodging of strangers, just as it was at Jerusalem when the disciples' feet were washed and Christ commanded them to wash one another's feet. They did not tarry all night; they were not there to be lodged. It was not the ancient custom that they were observing, for they stayed only until they had observed the ordinances—feet-washing and the communion—and then they departed. The Savior did not make it a part of lodging strangers, nor did Paul. While he spoke of it in connection with some good works which are not ordinances, he separated it from these as a distinct class by itself, which is to be observed only by "saints."

If Timothy, with that letter from Paul in his pocket, were to travel around to-day among the sects of Babylon where the people argue that feet-washing

is not an ordinance, but a mere act of hospitality, and he should hunt for a widow that washed the saints' feet and met the other requirements, he would certainly have a long hunt. The sects would not be overburdened with the support of such widows. But I am glad to say, dear reader, that in the church of God, among the saints to-day, he would find many widows who perfectly meet the requirements. The reason is, we practise this rite just as the church did in Paul and Timothy's day, and as Jesus commanded.

But why is feet-washing mentioned in with home duties, if it does not belong to that class? Simply because the apostle is enumerating the qualifications of a widow who was to be supported by the church. These qualifications included both home and church duties, or good works. Thus, he had to mention both together, although he was careful to separate them. Home duties were to husband, children, strangers, and the afflicted. Church duties were only to "the saints." In the very same manner the apostle enumerates the qualifications of an elder to be ordained. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee: If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy,

temperate; holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." Tit. 1: 5-9. Home duties and church duties are mentioned here together, and that alternately. Home duties—"the husband of one wife," "having faithful children," "not given to wine," "a lover of hospitality," etc. Church duties—"the steward of God," "just," "holy," "holding fast the faithful word," "exhort and convince the gainsayers," etc. In 1 Tim. 3: 1-13, speaking of the qualifications of ministers and deacons, Paul mentions home and church duties together. The entire class mentioned are good works. The same is true in 1 Tim. 5: 9, 10, where the qualifications of the widow are mentioned. Home duties and church duties are mentioned together. They are very similar to those mentioned in reference to the ministry. Home duties—"the wife of one man," "if she have brought up children," "lodged strangers," "relieved the afflicted." Church duties—"if she have washed the saints' feet." All these are different classes of good works.

The following clear logic is from "Bradley on Feet-Washing":

"When Paul wrote to the Corinthians to keep the ordinances as he delivered them, it was only necessary to specify the one over which they were disputing or had gotten wrong. In a general way he included them all,—baptism, the Lord's Supper and feet-washing. Nor did he exclude anything else taught or

commanded of God. When he commanded the Thesalonians to keep the traditions he had delivered to them, not one of the ordinances is specified, yet they are all included together with every other good work commanded of God and taught by the apostles. When Paul wrote to Timothy about the conditions on which the widows were to be received into special favor of the church, there is but one of the ordinances mentioned; yet they are all included in 1 Tim. 5: 10; for the words 'every good work' include everything commanded of God. In this case nothing is included in the words 'every good work,' except what God has enjoined upon the women in the church with a commandment; for Paul would not make anything not commanded of God a condition on which the church might or could take care of its destitute widows; neither could or would he ignore what God had enjoined upon them, or any part of what God had enjoined upon them, and thus burden the church with women that were not worthy of their care. Then, it is not reasonable that Paul would make obligatory such good works as raising children, lodging strangers, and relieving the afflicted, and then ignore the ordinances.

"But as I have said, the words 'every good work' includes every ordinance and everything else that God had commanded, everything of a religious or divine order from the smallest act of charity to the greatest ordinance ever enjoined upon the church of Christ,—all things that Jesus did and taught us to do. The

institution of the supper and the administering of the same, his being baptized and commanding it, the institution of feet-washing and commanding the same, the healing the sick, the raising the dead, casting out devils, rebuking hypocrites, feeding the multitudes, . . . —yes, all from the humblest act of his life to the greatest miracle he ever wrought were the works of God, the Father that sent him, and were indeed good works—works of righteousness—holy works that always pleased the Father. Then, when Paul said, ‘If she have diligently followed every good work,’ all things were included that God had enjoined upon them with commandment, and nothing more. The same enumeration begun by Paul, if carried to the end of the list, would have specified baptism, the supper, giving alms, obeying her husband, and many things that we, like Paul, can not nor will not enumerate now; but suffice to say, everything commanded of God.

“Paul just selects the five items, and specifies them to represent the things belonging to the five classes of good works enjoined upon Christian women, or that the character of things belonging to each class of good works might appear or be known. Now, I know of but five classes of good works enjoined on Christian women, or made obligatory by a commandment; and as I have already stated, no other good works except those commanded of God could be made a condition of membership for a poor destitute widow in the beneficiaries of the church. The five classes

of good works enjoined upon a woman I will now mention. One is her loyalty to her husband, or her duties as a wife. These things are commanded of God and taught by the apostles. See Rom. 7:2, 3; Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:5; 1 Cor. 11:7-10; Eph. 5:22-24. 1 Cor. 14:37. If the reader will search the above scriptures in connection with others you will find all the duties of a wife to her husband, and you will find that they are all commanded of God. The woman who obeys God in these things is a wife indeed. This is one class of good works, and when Paul spoke to Timothy, who knew the scriptures (2 Tim. 3:15), of a widow as having been the wife of one man, the character of things in that catalogue, or class of good works were understood. Then the next class of good works is a mother's duty to her children. See Gen. 1:28; Eph. 6:4. By searching the scriptures you can find everything in this class of good works, and that they are commanded of God. When Paul said, 'If she have brought up children,' then everything in this catalogue was also understood. Another class of good works is duty to strangers. This is a good work of charity, and is commanded of God. See Heb. 13:2; 1 Cor. 14:37. And when Paul said, 'If she have lodged strangers,' everything in that catalogue and belonging to that class of good works was understood. Then another class of good works is duty to the afflicted. See Luke 10:30-37. James calls this class or character of good works pure religion. See Jas. 1:27. Now, if you will examine the scriptures you

will see that the things in this class are enjoined with a command. Then when Paul said, 'If she have relieved the afflicted,' everything in this catalogue was understood. The other class of good works is her duties to God in obeying him, in keeping the ordinances. These, it seems, the apostles were never forgetful of. And when Paul said, 'If she have washed the saints' feet,' all the rest of the good works of this character or class were understood. He could have said, 'If she have kept or taken the Lord's Supper,' and it would have signified the things of this class of good works; but I believe that it was in divine counsel that he should say, 'If she have washed the saints' feet,' for he had specified both the other ordinances in his other Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans, and he specifies this one in this letter.

"Now, as it is neither scriptural nor reasonable that Paul would take the responsibility to make any good work or anything else a condition on which the widows were to be cared for, and also which God never commanded, then it is evident that feet-washing was one of the conditions on which they were to be cared for by the church; then it is just as evident that God had enjoined it upon them by a commandment; then it is a truth that if God enjoined it upon the church of Christ, the command is recorded somewhere in the New Testament; and then it is also evident that the command is recorded in the thirteenth chapter of John, 14, 15 verses, as that is the only

place it is mentioned before Paul specifies it as above mentioned.

“Now, there are five classes of good works, yet they are all works of love, made obligatory because of duty. Four classes contain all necessary things of our duty to our families, our neighbors, and our enemies, friends or strangers. The other contains all things of our duty to God. They are all enjoined upon us with a commandment, because God loves us and wants us to love one another and to love him. Then God nowhere enjoins foot-washing upon the church of Christ as a literal necessity. Notice, Paul speaks of the widow first as ‘having been the wife of one man’; but he does not say a word about her washing her husband’s feet, for God nowhere commands a woman to wash her husband’s feet; and Paul would not make anything obligatory that God never commanded. Second, ‘If she have brought up children,’ but he does not say a word about her washing the children’s feet, for God nowhere commands a woman to wash her children’s feet. I suppose it was not necessary to give such a commandment to a Christian mother, for a woman that is too trifling to wash her children’s feet if she is able and they are not, and really need it, is too trifling to be a Christian; hence, not a word about her washing the children’s feet. And ‘if she have lodged strangers’; Paul says not a word about her washing the strangers’ feet. Strangers, husbands and children can wash their own feet when able, and no Christian woman needs be commanded

to wash them if they are sick or helpless, and their feet need washing. Fourth, 'If she have washed the saints' feet.' Fifth, 'If she have relieved the afflicted.' Not a word about her having washed the feet of the afflicted; for God nowhere commands a woman to wash the feet of the afflicted; no Christian needs such a commandment; but 'If she have washed the saints' feet.' Now, God commands the saints to wash one another's feet (John 13: 14, 15) and gave us the example himself (verse 4, 5, 12, 15); not because it was necessary for cleanliness, for they were clean, every whit (verse 10), but for our happiness. Verse 17. Then, as it is a good work enjoined upon us with a commandment, and not a work of necessity, it is not obligatory as a duty to our fellow creatures. Then, it falls in the catalogue of good works, made obligatory because of our duty to God. Hence, it is both reasonable and scriptural to conclude that it is an ordinance; for in doing this we not only manifest our own humility, but show forth the humility of our Lord, who, though our Lord and Savior, was among us as one that served. Then, we should do it to the glory of God. We ought to do it, not to be saved, but because we are saved.

"The above five classes of good works are all that I am acquainted with, and show forth all the graces that go to make up a perfect woman—the virtuous, devoted and obedient wife, the true mother, the good neighbor, the true citizen, and the humble Christian; and that is all there is on the human side of salva-

tion; and if done in love to God and our families, our friends, our enemies and strangers, we fulfil the law of charity out of a pure heart and good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.

“Now, while the words ‘every good work’ include all the ordinances as well as everything else commanded of God in the New Testament, this does not prove that all the good works of the different classes are ordinances as we now use the word ordinance; nor does it prove that all good works are of the same class or character. or that all the works in each class are identical. As Paul specifies one item of each class, the things of each class are comprehended.”

One thought in conclusion. Christ, the head and the underlying foundation of the church, instituted feet-washing. He both practised and commanded it. The apostles who are foundation-stones in the building, practised it and delivered it to the churches. The primitive saints, who lay as lively stones in the building, next to the apostles, observed it. This places it in the building, in the church, and who has authority to take it out? It was placed there to stay; and we, who are members of that same church, will keep this ordinance till He comes again.

THE END.

Additional copies may be ordered from

FAITH PUBLISHING HOUSE

P. O. Box 518

GUTHRIE, OKLAHOMA 73044

